SIX SERMONS.

I. On Remiſſion of SINS.

II. On the Honour of the CHRISTIAN PRIESTHOOD.

III. The Extent of Chriſt's Commiſſion to BAPTISE.

IV. The CHRISTIAN ALTAR and SACRIFICE.

V. The [illegible] RELAPSE.

VI. TRUE [illegible]ERATION.

To which is Added,

A VINDICATION of the Sermon on *Remiſſion of Sins*, againſt Dr. *Cannon* and others.

By *THOMAS BRETT*, LL.D.
Rector of *Bettesbanger* in KENT.

LONDON,
Printed for JOHN WYAT, at the *Roſe* in *St. Paul's Church-yard*. 1715.

SIX SERMONS.

I. On Remission of SINS.

II. On the Honour of the CHRISTIAN PRIESTHOOD.

III. The Extent of Christ's Commission to BAPTISE.

IV. The CHRISTIAN ALTAR and SACRIFICE.

V. The [illegible] RELAPSE.

VI. TRUE [illegible] RATION.

To which is prefixed,

A VINDICATION of the Sermon on Remission of Sins, against Dr. Clarke and others.

By THOMAS BAKER, LL.D.
Rector of Bere-Church in KENT.

LONDON,
Printed for JOHN WYAT, at the Rose in St. Paul's Church-yard. 1715.

A SERMON ON Remission of Sins, According to the SCRIPTURES AND THE DOCTRINE OF THE Church of England.

By *THOMAS BRETT*, LL.D.
Rector of *Bettesbanger* in KENT.

With a PREFACE in its Vindication from POPERY.

The Third Edition.

LONDON,
Printed by *E. J.* for JOHN WYAT at the *Rose* in *St. Paul's Church-yard.* 1715.

Price Four Pence.

This High-flown Sermon is alluded to by Burnet in terms of unfavourable censure, in his "History of his own Times," Vol. 6, p. 115, Clarendon Press Edition, 1823.

W. W.

Market Harborough,

Jan. 2, 1827

SERMON

ON

Remission of Sins,

According to the

SCRIPTURES

AND THE

DOCTRINE

OF THE

Church of England.

By THOMAS BURGESS, LL.D.

Rector of Tetsworth in Kent.

With a PREFACE in its Vindication from POPERY.

The Fifth Edition.

LONDON,

Printed by T. Bensley, for John White at the

THE PREFACE.

HE many Mis-representations, which have been made of this *Sermon*, since it was preach'd in this great Town, have forc'd me to Print it in my own Vindication; That all the World may see and be convinc'd, that notwithstanding the strange Clamors and Outcries made concerning it, as if it was downright Popery, and contain'd a Doctrine very prejudicial both to Church and State; yet that it contains no other Doctrine, than what was taught by our Saviour and his Apostles, by the Primitive Church, and the Establish'd Church of *England*.

If I had said that the Priest might Absolve absolutely, and Pardon Sins by his own Authority, that he might remit the Sins of the Impenitent, or retain those of the Penitent; then indeed the Accusation had been just, and I had been guilty of false Doctrine. Or if I had talk'd about Contrition and Attrition, of daily or annual Auricular Confession, or indeed made it any ways necessary for a Man to confess all his Sins to the

Priest, or allow'd that a Priest might give Absolution upon a Man's bare Confession, or his going a Pilgrimage, or giving a Sum of Money to some Pious or Charitable Use, or doing any other thing prescribed to him, which he might do without being really and truly Penitent; then had the Accusation of Popery been just and warrantable. But as I have said nothing of all this, and have only taught, that *Jesus Christ hath left Power to his Church, to absolve all Sinners, who truly repent and believe in him*, as our Church teaches in the very Words of our Liturgy, in the Office for Visiting the Sick; I cannot but think it hard to have this call'd Popish Doctrine, since it is a Doctrine establish'd both by our Convocations and our Parliaments, and has been subscrib'd to by all the Bishops and Pastors of the Church of *England*. So that, those who condemn this Doctrine as Popish, condemn not only me, but all the Prelates and inferiour Ministers of this Church, who have subscrib'd the same, and are bound to maintain it.

As to what I have said of the Power of retaining Sins, I refer my self to the Rubrick before the Office for the Holy Communion, where the Priest has Power given him, to repell notorious evil Livers from that Sacrament; and to the Practice of all our Bishops in their Ecclesiastical Courts. This Right of the Church, to retain the Sins of the obstinately Impenitent, by excluding them from the Communion of the Church, has been fully maintain'd and vindicated

by the Judicious and Learned Dr. *Potter*, in his Excellent *Diſcourſe of Church Government*, *chap.* 5. *pag.* 330. Second Edit. *&c.* To which I therefore refer the Reader, for his further Satisfaction in that Point.

I had no Thoughts when I compoſed this Sermon, of putting it to the Preſs, as it now is; but intended, if ever I ſhould ſee occaſion to publiſh it, to have taken ſome more Pains about it, and to have explained and clear'd ſome Paſſages, and indeed to have enlarg'd it to a juſt Treatiſe. But after it had made ſuch Noiſe in the World, and been cried out upon as *Popiſh*, ſo that I was thereby forc'd to publiſh it in my own Defence, as a Vindication of my ſelf from ſuch an unjuſt Aſperſion; I was not then at liberty to correct or amend any Part of it, but oblig'd to publiſh it as I preach'd it; that no Man might take Occaſion to ſay, That though the Sermon I printed was not *Popiſh*, yet that which I preached was ſo. And to ſatisfie all Perſons that the Printed Sermon is the very ſame, Word for Word, with that which was Preach'd, the Manuſcript is ſtill preſerved by the *Book-ſeller*, who is ready to give any Man leave to compare them, who ſhall think it worth his Trouble.

Now becauſe the Sermon was too long to be preach'd at one time, in thoſe Places where I preach'd but one Part of the Day, I omitted that which is enclos'd between two Crotchets [ ] from

from *pag.* 13. to *pag.* 17. And again from *pag.* 25 to *pag.* 31. where it ends thus, *God is no Respecter of Persons.*

If any Person doubt, whether the Doctrine I have here publiſhed, was always the Doctrine of this Church, even from the Beginning of the Reformation to this Time: Let him read Archbiſhop *Cranmer*, the Martyr's, *Sermon of the Keys*; Biſhop *Andrews*'s Sermon on the ſame Text with that which I preach'd on; Biſhop *Bull*'s *Practice of Piety*, in that Place, where he ſhews, how *the Sick Perſon ought to ſend for ſome Godly and Religious Paſtor*; and Dr. *Comber* on the *Common-Prayer*. I doubt not but there are many more excellent Diſcourſes of this Subject, though I have not ſeen them: But theſe are ſufficient to ſhew, That what I have here publiſhed, has been the Senſe of the Religious and Learned of the Church of *England*, ever ſince its Reformation from *Popery*.

If any Paſſage in this Sermon may appear Harſh, or any ways Exceptionable at firſt ſight, (though I am not conſcious that there is any ſuch Paſſage) I deſire the Candid Reader to compare it with what goes before, and follows after, where I doubt not but he will find it fully cleared.

I ſhall conclude this Preface with Dr. *Comber*'s Words juſt before his Paraphraſe on the *Abſolution*, to be uſed at the Viſitation of the Sick:

The

The Montaniſts *and the* Novatian Hereticks *of old (like our Modern* Separatiſts) *would* Abſolve *none: But the* Donatiſts *and* Audiani *(like thoſe of* Rome) *aſſumed to themſelves an Abſolute Power; while the Church of* England *(as the Primitive Catholick Church was wont) goes a Middle way, and neither Abſolves any Abſolutely by her own Power, nor yet denies to Abſolve in Chriſt's Name thoſe who are truly Penitent, and deſire it; and doubtleſs, if Men were not prejudiced by Evil Principles, our Sick and Dying Perſons might have as much Comfort by this excellent part of the Office, as the Chriſtians of old found in it: And if they rightly knew the Benefit thereof, and were duly prepared for it, nothing could better fit them for a chearful Paſſage out of this World.*

The PREFACE.

The Montanists and the Novatian Hereticks of old (like our Modern Separatists) would Absolve none: But the Donatists and Audians (like those of Rome) assumed to themselves an Absolute Power; while the Church of England (as the Primitive Catholick Church was wont) goes a Middle way, and neither Absolves any Absolutely by her own Power, nor yet denies to Absolve in Christ's Name those who are truly Penitent, and desire it; and doubtless, if Men were not prejudiced by Evil Principles, our Sick and Dying Persons might have as much Comfort by this excellent part of the Office, as the Christians of old found in it: And if they rightly knew the Benefit thereof, and were duly prepared for it, nothing could better fit them for a cheerful Passage out of this World.

A SERMON ON Remission of Sins.

JOHN xx. 21, 22, 23.

Then said Jesus to them again, Peace be unto you: as my Father hath sent me, even so send I you.

And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy-Ghost.

Whose soever Sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever Sins ye retain, they are retained.

WHEN our blessed Saviour had compleated our Redemption by his Death and Resurrection, and had appear'd to *Mary Magdalen* and others, who by his Order had acquainted the Apostles with it; He vouchsafed to make them a Visit himself, the very same Day at

Even, at ſuch time as they were privately got together, to enquire of one another what was become of him, and conſult where they might ſeek him; and learn who had ſeen him, and who had not ſeen him: And though they had ſhut the Doors for fear of the *Jews*, yet he came in and ſtood in the midſt of them. And having given them the Salutation of Peace, *he ſhewed them his Hands and his Side*, fully to ſatisfie them that he was really the ſame Perſon, their Maſter, whom they had ſeen crucified. And finding them perfectly convinc'd that it was He himſelf, and no Angel or Apparition, and that they were rejoyced at the Sight of him: He then not only gave them again the Bleſſing of Peace, but alſo a moſt ample Commiſſion, ſaying, *As my Father*, &c. How well does this Commiſſion, given at this time, ſet forth Chriſt's great Love and tender Care of us? in that as ſoon as he had accompliſhed his own Reſurrection, he took immediate Care to provide a Means, by which we might riſe alſo from the Death of Sin to the Life of Righteouſneſs. He could not ſo conveniently give it before his Death, becauſe 'till then *he had not made his Soul an Offering for Sin.* For 'till then, *he had not ſhed his Blood, without which there is no Remiſſion of Sins.* Therefore it is that this Power was promiſed before, but not given 'till now.

Luke xxiv. 33.

Iſ. liii. 10.

Heb. ix. 22.

Matth. xvi. 19.

xvii. 18.

But having made a full Atonement for the Sins of the whole World, he judg'd it expedient immediately to give his Apoſtles a Commiſſion, as his *Ambaſſadors*, to reconcile Sinners to God, *committing unto them the Word of Reconciliation.* From the Words of the Text therefore I will ſhew you,

2 Cor. v. 19.

Firſt. That our Saviour did leave with his Apoſtles a Power to remit or retain Sins.

Secondly,

Secondly, That this Power was tranſmitted by them to their Succeſſors, and continues in the Church to this Day. And,

Thirdly, How uſeful and expedient it is, that there ſhould be ſuch a Power in the Church; and the great Benefit it may be to the People, if rightly uſed and applied.

I. *Firſt* then, I will ſhew you, That our Saviour did leave with his Apoſtles a Power to remit or retain Sins; that is, to pardon or forgive Sins, or elſe to bind them more cloſely, ſo as the Sinner ſhould not be releaſed from his Sin, or pardoned by God, 'till they had releaſed him alſo. This Power is therefore in other places (for it is ſpoke of more than once in the Holy Goſpel) call'd *the Power of binding and looſing*, or *the Power of the Keys*. Thus upon St. *Peter*'s Confeſſion of *Chriſt*, and acknowledging Him to be *the Son of the living God*, which he did in the Name not of himſelf alone, but of all the reſt, (for the Queſtion, *Whom ſay ye that I am?* was put to all the Diſciples) our Saviour promiſed to him, and with him to the reſt, ſaying, *I will give unto thee the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven: And whatſoever thou ſhalt bind on Earth, ſhall be bound in Heaven: Whatſoever thou ſhalt looſe on Earth, ſhall be looſed in Heaven.* And a little after he took another occaſion to repeat and renew his Promiſe to all whom he ſhould appoint to be Governors of his Church, ſaying, *Verily I ſay unto you, whatſoever ye ſhall bind on Earth, ſhall be bound in Heaven; And whatſoever ye ſhall looſe on Earth, ſhall be looſed in Heaven.* And having thus twice promiſed to give this Power to his Apoſtles, immediately after his Reſurrection he inveſted them with it, ſaying in the Words of the Text, *As my Father hath ſent me, ſo ſend*

Mat. xvi. 16.

Ver. 19.

Mat. xviii. 18.

ſend I you: Whoſe ſoever Sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whoſe ſoever Sins ye retain, they are retained. If we conſider in what a ſolemn manner *Chriſt* veſted the Apoſtles with this Power, it may convince us, that theſe were not Words of Courſe, but of great Weight and Moment, intended for the perpetual Benefit of his Church; that Church which they were to collect and ſettle in all Nations. He twice promiſed this Power (as I have ſhewed you) before he veſted them with it: And when he did veſt them with it, 'twas in a very ſolemn manner.

Firſt, He bleſſed them with a Repetition of his firſt Salutation, ſaying, *Peace be unto you*: intimating by this Repetition of his Bleſſing, that this Salutation was not deſign'd as a meer Civil Complement, at his firſt Appearance unto them, but that he really deſign'd, and actually would beſtow upon them more than a common Favour.

Secondly, Having (as St. *Matthew* tells us, acquainted them, that *All Power was given unto him in Heaven and in Earth*; conſequently, that he had Authority ſufficient to give them as large a Commiſſion as he pleaſed, he then lets them know that he would give them as full Power and Authority in his Church as they could deſire, and that they ſhould be his Deputies and Vicegerents, to act in his ſtead: *As my Father hath ſent me* (ſays he) *ſo ſend I you*: The ſame Power which my Father has committed to me, the ſame do I now confer upon you, whom I appoint to Act in my Name, as my Vicars-general, or Subſtitutes.

Mat. xxviii 18.

Thirdly, *He breathed on them, and ſaith unto them, Receive ye the Holy-Ghoſt.* Whereby he furniſhed them with Ability or Capacity to execute that Power and Authority which he had given them. And then,

In the *Laſt* place, he tells them, That he particularly commits to them that Power which he him-

himself exercis'd Here on Earth to forgive Sins: And that *as the Son of Man had Power on Earth to forgive Sins*, so should they; and therefore he says to them, *Whose soever Sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever Sins ye retain, they are retained.* Mat. ix. 6.

And can we think that all this Form, this Solemnity, this Circumstance, was for nothing? Did *Christ* pretend to grant a Power which he did not actually give? Did he so directly and in such plain Words say, *Whose soever Sins ye remit, they are remitted; and whose soever Sins ye retain, they are retained*; and yet did they receive no Power thereby to remit and retain Sins? It may seem very strange, and perhaps sound harsh and uncouth in your Ears, that any Men, how Great, how Good, or how Holy soever, should have the Power to forgive Sins. It is a Doctrine you have been so little us'd to hear, that I have just cause to fear I shall have great Prejudices to conquer, before I shall be able to convince you of the Truth of it.

However, since it is a true Christian Doctrine, a Doctrine most plainly deliver'd in the Gospel by Our Saviour himself, in three several places, as I have shew'd you; it is very convenient that you should know and understand it. And if you have not been us'd to hear it preach'd, it is the more necessary that I should preach it to you now; for it is my Duty, as of all Pastors and Ministers of the Church, *To declare unto you all the Counsel of God, and to keep back nothing that is profitable for you.* And sure nothing can be more profitable, than to teach you where, how, and from whom you are to receive Remission of your Sins. Acts xx. 20, 37.

You may perhaps, as the *Scribes* did, *reason in your hearts*, and say, *Why doth this Man thus speak Blasphemies? Who can* Mark ii. 6.

forgive

forgive Sins but God only? But I desire you to consider, That tho' God only can forgive Sins, yet he can and may forgive them in such Manner, and by such Methods as himself pleases. And it would be a most high Presumption in us to tell God, how, and in what manner He is or ought to forgive us. Are we to chuse the Means for Him by which He should pardon us? Are we to prescribe Rules to Him, and say, we cannot accept your Pardon, unless you give it immediately Your Self, and not by the Ministration of Man? If we have been Rebellious against our Prince, and he sends us a Pardon by one of his Servants, shall we not thankfully receive it? It is true, only God can forgive Sins; but he may, if he sees fit, forgive them by the Ministry of Man. And if he *gives Power and Commandment to his Ministers to declare and pronounce to his People, being Penitent, the Absolution and Remission of their Sins*; shall the People think they receive no Pardon, because God does not pronounce this Absolution to them Himself? If I depute a Man to act in my Name, that Man's Act, perform'd according to my Deputation, shall undoubtedly bind me: If I give him Commission to release a Debt, his Receipt is my Discharge, and I have obliged my self to ratifie and confirm it. If therefore God commits a Power to his Ministers to forgive Sins, he binds himself to ratifie and confirm that Absolution which they pronounce, agreeable to the Commission he has given them. And therefore, tho' the Declaration of this Pardon or Forgiveness, which we call by the Name of *Absolution*, be not only pronounced, but particularly apply'd to particular Persons, by Men like our selves; yet being done by God's Commission, who gives them this Authority, it is reasonable it should have the same Effect, as if He did it by Himself immediately.

And

And as God may give Commiſſion to Man *to forgive Sins*, ſo may he give him a Commiſſion *to bind or retain them*: For God may grant Commiſſions as large as He pleaſes; there is no Authority ſuperiour to his, to limit him in whatſoever he pleaſes to do. Therefore, as he may give Power to a Man to declare another's Sins to be pardon'd, upon due Teſtimonies of Repentance; ſo he may give him Power to declare and pronounce, that they ſhall not be pardon'd, 'till ſuch due Teſtimonies of Repentance are given. He may give him Power to with-hold from him all thoſe Pledges of his Love which he has given, as the Means and Aſſurances of his Good-will to us. And the Sinner thus debarr'd from the Means of Grace, ſhall be alſo thereby debarr'd from the Hopes of Glory, if God has ſeen fit to give ſuch Power to Man. That God may commit ſuch a Power to ſuch Perſons as he thinks fit to Commiſſion to be his Deputies or Vicegerents, is, I think, indiſputable. For if he hath Power to appoint Subſtitutes to act for him, (which I think cannot be queſtion'd; For who ſhall ſay unto Him, What do'ſt thou?) then may he give theſe Subſtitutes as large a Power as he ſees expedient. So that I think nothing can be plainer, than that God can give ſuch Power to Men, if he pleaſes. And if he does give this Power to any Set of Men, yet ſtill we may properly enough ſay, That *none can forgive Sins but God only*; ſince none can forgive them, but ſuch as he Commiſſions to it, and in ſuch manner as his Commiſſion directs them: And what is done by his Commiſſion, may truly be ſaid to be done by Himſelf. And if he does not ratifie and confirm what is done in this Caſe, according to his own Order and Appointment, he may ſeem not to conſult his Honour, which we doubt not will always induce him to maintain and ſupport

his

his Servants in the Execution of his own Orders. But we know he is unchangeable, and what he has said he will stand by, nor suffer his Authority to be affronted in the meanest of his Ministers.

I conceive, therefore, that nothing more remains for me to do, than to satisfie you, That God has actually given such an Authority to his Ministers. And if he hath done so, this Authority cannot be taken from them, nor ought to be denied them, although *none can forgive Sins but God only.* For if he thinks fit to forgive Sins by the Ministry of Man, who can say it is unfit or unreasonable that some Men should have such Power? Now that God did give such Power to *Christ*, whilst here on Earth, to forgive Sins, even as he was Man, is most evident; for he wrought a Miracle, to convince the Unbelieving Scribes, That the *Son of Man had Power on Earth to forgive Sins.* And when *all Power was given to him both in Heaven and Earth*, after he had triumphed over Death by a glorious Resurrection, and was ready to ascend into Heaven, to take Possession of his Kingdom there; that his Church might not suffer in his Absence, for want of Pastors and Governors to take Care of it, he committed all his Power and Authority, as Head of the Church, to his Apostles. This the Text expresly shews, *As my Father sent me*, says Christ, *so send I you.* As if he had said; With the same Power and Authority that my Father sent me into the World to constitute and govern my Church, I send you and your Successors, I make you my Vicars or Deputies, to act in my Name, and in my Stead, and give you all Spiritual Power and Authority directive and coercive, which is necessary to your Office and Charge, in gathering, fixing and governing Churches unto the End of the World; and whatsoever Power and Authority ye have seen me exercise, that may

Mat. ii. 10.

ye

ye exerciſe alſo. Since then he gave the Apoſtles all that Power and Authority, which he himſelf was veſted with by the Father, with relation to the Church; (for if he did not veſt them with ſuch Authority, he could not ſend them as he was ſent by the Father, *who gave him to be the Head over all things to the Church*:) And ſince he himſelf ſo clearly demonſtrated, That he had *Power on Earth to forgive Sins*; we might very reaſonably infer from hence, That the Apoſtles who were veſted with all his Power, as he was the *Son of Man*, ſhould alſo have this *Power to forgive Sins*. I ſay, this would be but a very fair natural Inference, ſuppoſing *Chriſt* had actually ſaid no more to them than, *As my Father hath ſent me, ſo ſend I you*. However, to take away all Doubt, and prevent all Diſputes on this important Subject, (for *Remiſſion of Sins* is the End of our Redemption, the End for which *Chriſt* came into the World) he thought convenient to let them know by expreſs Words, that he had conferr'd this Power upon them, ſaying, *Whoſe ſoever Sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whoſe ſoever Sins ye retain, they are retained.* And I would fain know, by what Words it was poſſible for him to veſt them with this Power, in a more plain and expreſs manner than he has done in theſe? And ſhall we yet doubt, whether he gave them Power to remit Sins or not?]

Eph. ii. 22.

And we find that the Apoſtles, after this Commiſſion was confirmed to them by the Deſcent of the *Holy Ghoſt* on the Day of *Pentecoſt*, conceiv'd they had this Power and Authority *to remit*, or *retain Sins*; and that they *preach'd Repentance and Remiſſion of Sins, in the Name of Chriſt*. And as they *preached*, ſo alſo they *baptized in the Name of Jeſus Chriſt, for the Remiſſion of Sins*. But you will ſay, Is this all that is meant by

Act. ii. 38.

the Apoſtles Power to forgive Sins? There needed not ſo much to have been ſaid to prove this: No Body denies that they had Power to *Preach* and *Baptize*: It is readily granted by all that pretend to believe the Goſpel, that the Apoſtles might ſpeak to all People, and ſay, *Repent ye, and* Act. iii. 19. *be converted, that your Sins may be blotted out*: And that when Men gave due Teſtimonies of their *Faith* and *Repentance*, they might Baptize them alſo. But might not any other *Chriſtian* do this as well as the *Apoſtles*? May not any Man ſay to another, *Repent and be converted, and your Sins ſhall be forgiven you*? And if the Perſon to whom theſe Words are ſaid by any Man, does *repent* and is *converted*; ſhall not his Sins be forgiven him, as effectually as if he had been *converted* by the Preaching of an Apoſtle? In anſwer to this, I ſhall tell you, That altho' theſe Words, *Repent and be converted, and your Sins ſhall be forgiven you*, are eaſily ſaid, and might in the firſt Ages of the Church, or at any time ſince, be ſaid by any private *Chriſtian*, as well as an *Apoſtle*; yet neither the ſaying this, nor the Converſion of the Sinner upon the hearing of it, could blot out his Sins: It qualify'd him indeed to receive Remiſſion of Sins, but his Sins were not thereby remitted but by his *Baptiſm*, the Ordinance which *Chriſt* himſelf was pleaſed to inſtitute for the Remiſſion of Sins: And that could be effectually adminiſtred by none but the *Apoſtles*, or ſuch as they Commiſſion'd for that Purpoſe: I ſay, *effectually adminiſtred*; becauſe, though any Man could perform the Ceremony, either of Dipping, or of Pouring Water on the Perſon to be Baptiz'd; yet if he had no Commiſſion ſo to do, inſtead of *remitting Sins* thereby, he would rather add to the Weight of them, and profane this Divine Inſtitution. But being done by an *Apoſtle*, or by One Commiſſion'd

by

by an *Apoſtle* for that Purpoſe, it was as effectual to remit Sins, as if perform'd by *Chriſt himſelf*, becauſe as the Text tells us, He *ſent* the Apoſtles, even as his Father *had ſent him*; that is, with the ſame Power and Authority, particularly with the Power to *remit and retain Sins*. Therefore to whomſoever they miniſtred the Sacrament of *Baptiſm*, which was appointed for the *Remiſſion of Sins*, that Perſon's Sins were actually remitted by it. *Repentance* and *Converſion* did indeed qualify the Perſon for receiving the Ordinance, but it was his *Baptiſm* that waſhed away, or blotted out his Sins. And thus by the Miniſtration of this Sacrament, did the *Apoſtles* remit the Sins of thoſe whom they admitted into the *Church of Chriſt*.

But though *Baptiſm* was appointed for the *Remiſſion of Sins*, yet it did not make thoſe who had received that Sacrament uncapable of ſinning again. Whilſt Men are Men, they will be liable to Temptations, and will fall into grievous Sins ſometimes, as well after Baptiſm as before. And this we find they did in the Apoſtle's Days, tho' moſt of thoſe which we read of to have been baptiz'd by them, were baptized in their riper Years. Witneſs the inceſtuous Perſon at *Corinth*, who *married his Father's Wife*: A Sin ſo heinous, as the very *Gentiles* or *Heathens* abominated it. *Such Fornication*, ſays St. *Paul*, *as is not ſo much as named among the Gentiles, that one ſhould have his Father's Wife*: Yet when this Man teſtified his Repentance for this great Sin, though he could not be baptized again, yet the Apoſtle conceived he had Authority to remit his Sins, and accordingly *forgave it in the Perſon of Chriſt*. From whence it is evident, that St. *Paul* conceived he had the ſame Authority to remit his Sins, which *Chriſt* himſelf exerciſed here

1 Cor. v. 1.

2 Cor. ii. 10.

on Earth, who ſaid to the ſick Man in
Mat. ii. 5. the Goſpel, *Thy Sins are forgiven thee.*
And foraſmuch as he was ſent by *Chriſt*, even as *Chriſt* himſelf was ſent by the Father, and had receiv'd ſuch Authority, that whoſe ſoever Sins he *remitted*, *they were remitted unto them*, no doubt but when upon this Man's Repentance, he forgave him his Sin in the Perſon of *Chriſt*, that Man's Sin was actually forgiven him. The Man's Repentance indeed qualify'd him to be forgiven, but it was the Apoſtle that did forgive him. Which certainly he would not have done, if he had not known that our Lord had given him Power and Authority to remit Sins.

Thus then it is evident from the Holy Scriptures, that the *Apoſtles* conceiv'd themſelves to be veſted with an Authority to remit or pardon Sins. That becauſe out of the Church of *Chriſt* there is no Remiſſion of Sins; therefore in order to remit the Sins of thoſe whom they converted, they firſt admitted them into the Church, by Baptizing them, and waſh'd away their Sins by that Sacrament: And when Men fell into Sin after *Baptiſm*, they then authoritatively pronounc'd the Remiſſion of Sins to ſuch as they found Penitent, ſaying, *I forgive*, or *abſolve thee from thy Sins, in the Perſon of Chriſt*, or to that Effect. So that I conceive nothing can be plainer from their Practice, than that they had Power on Earth to forgive Sins. And the Text aſſures us, That *whoſe ſoever Sins they remitted, they were remitted unto them.* And when they judged it neceſſary not to adminiſter the Sacrament of *Baptiſm* to any Man, or to deny him Abſolution for Sins committed after *Baptiſm*, that Man's Sins were not forgiven; for ſo ſays the Text, *Whoſe ſoever Sins ye retain, they are retained.*

They

They also remitted Sins, by the Administration of the other Sacrament, call'd the *Lord's Supper*, which we find the Apostles frequently administred, and thereby forgave the Sins of such penitent Christians as faithfully received the same at their Hands. For by the Administring that Sacrament, they gave to every faithful Receiver *the Blood of the New Testament, which was shed for many for the remission of sins.* Thus by the Ministration of these Sacraments, and the Absolution given to Penitents, they remitted their Sins; And by with-holding them from the Impenitent, they retained their Sins. Thus far then I suppose it must be granted, that the Apostles Power to remit and retain Sins, might and did actually reach.

Mat. xxvi. 28.

But the Apostles exercised this Power yet further, in the various Punishments and Corrections which they inflicted on obstinate Offenders. Thus St. *Peter* said to *Simon Magus*, when he offered Money for the Gift of the Holy Ghost, *Thy Money perish with thee— Thou hast neither Part nor Lot in this Matter.* By which Words he plainly cut him off from the Church, into which he had been baptized by *Philip*, and from all the Spiritual Benefits belonging to it; Thereby retaining or binding his Sin upon him till he should testify his Repentance. So also St. *Paul*, by his own Apostolick Authority, tho absent, yet in the Name of *Christ*, order'd the incestuous *Corinthian* to be separated from the Church, and *delivered to Satan for the destruction of the Flesh.* And both the Person offending, and the *Corinthians* also were so well satisfied, that this Sentence of the Apostle was ratified or confirmed in Heaven, that he expected no Forgiveness there till he had St. *Paul's* Pardon also, and therefore having duly testified his Repentance, his Brethren at *Corinth* desir'd

Act. viii. 20.

1 Cor. v. 5.

2 Cor. ii. 20.

that

that Apoſtle to forgive him, and ſo he *forgave him, in the Perſon of Chriſt.* The ſame Diſcipline he exercis'd on *Hymenæus* and *Philitus*, whom *he alſo delivered unto Satan, that they might learn not to blaſpheme.*

1 Tim. i. 20.

Thus did the Apoſtles not only forgive Sins by the Miniſtration of the Word and Sacraments, but they retained them alſo, by depriving obſtinate Offenders of thoſe Means of Grace: Nor could the Offenders which were ſo deprived or excommunicated, hope for any Pardon in Heaven, where the Apoſtle's Sentence was ratified, till that Apoſtle had forgiven them, and taken off his Cenſure from them. And St. *Paul* plainly alludes to this Power, when he threatens the *Corinthians to come unto them with a Rod*; and asks, If they will have him come ſo, *or in Love, and the Spirit of Meekneſs?* The *Apoſtles* had no Temporal Power, they could inflict no Corporal Puniſhments, the Rod which they had was a Spiritual One, which could be only to bind or retain their Sins: Which Sentence, if it was not ratified in Heaven, could ſignifie nothing at all. But the People well knew, that our Saviour had given them *the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven*, and that *whatſoever was bound by them on Earth, was bound in Heaven; whoſe ſoever ſins they retained* here, were *retained* there alſo, and therefore moſt juſtly feared this Rod, more than any Temporal Puniſhment whatſoever. If the *Apoſtle* retained their Sins, they had juſt Reaſon to be ſatisfied that God would never forgive them. For *Chriſt* having given the *Apoſtles* this Power, in the Words of the Text, ſtood engaged in his own Promiſe, to ratify and confirm their Sentence, being given according to the Rules preſcribed in his Goſpel: And therefore if he ſhould not bind in Heaven what they bound on Earth, he might ſeem to make void his own Commiſſion.

1 Cor. iv. 21.

miſſion. Wherefore it was in vain for any one ſo bound, to expect Pardon from him in Heaven, till they had receiv'd Abſolution from the *Apoſtle* that had bound them. Conſider, this is an Ordinance of Chriſt, That *Whatſoever his Miniſters ſhall bind on Earth*, or, as the Text explains it, *What ſins they ſhall retain* on Earth, *ſhall be retained*, ſhall be *bound in Heaven*: If therefore he forgives thoſe Sins in Heaven, which, according to his own Commiſſion, are bound on Earth, he makes void his own Ordinance. It is therefore neceſſary that ſuch Sins, at leaſt as are bound on Earth, ſhould be alſo looſed by the Perſon that binds them, before they are looſed in Heaven, or elſe *Chriſt* does not ſtand by and maintain his own Ordinance. And I ſay, 'tis neceſſary they ſhould be looſed by the Perſon that binds them; for if *Chriſt* himſelf will not looſe them, much leſs can any inferiour Miniſter of his do it. The Bond being ratified in Heaven, cannot be looſed till He that bound it, looſes it alſo, and then there is a Promiſe that it ſhall be looſed in Heaven. Therefore the *Corinthian* who was bound by St. *Paul*, ſought not to be looſed by St. *Peter*, or by *Apollos*, tho' they alſo had preach'd at *Corinth*, but by St. *Paul* himſelf who had bound him. And when he had looſed him, he had no reaſon longer to queſtion but that he was looſed in Heaven, having Chriſt's faithful Promiſe for it.

Thus I truſt I have ſhew'd you, and I hope convinc'd you too, that the Apoſtles conceived themſelves to be veſted with a Power of remitting and retaining Sins. And exerciſed it not only in the Miniſtration of the Word and Sacraments, but alſo by caſting out notorious and obſtinate Offenders from the Communion of the Church, and not receiving them again till they had teſtified their Repentance.

II. *Se-*

II. *Secondly*, Therefore I will shew you, that this was not a Power granted personally or peculiarly to the *Apostles*, but they were to have Successors in this, as well as the other parts of their Office. For as St. *Matthew* tells us, our Saviour promised to be with them *always*, *even unto the end of the World*. Besides, if this Power was not to continue in the Church to the end of the Word, then neither the Ministry of the Word and Sacraments: For, as I shewed you, it was by these Ordinances that the Apostles remitted Sins: And Sins are remitted by these Sacred Institutions, even to this Day, or else they must have lost their primitive Nature, and the very End for which they were instituted. And if the Commission hold good as to one part of it, it must do so in the other part also; therefore if *Bishops* and their *Presbyters*, the Successors of the Apostles, have a Right to pardon Sins, by the Ministration of the Word and Sacraments, they must have a Right to pardon them by Absolution, and to retain them also by Excommunication, or other Spiritual Censures, as the Apostles had; and their Censures are also ratified in Heaven, as those of the *Apostles* were, so that no Power on Earth can release them, but only he that bound them. And that the *Church* always conceiv'd her self to be vested with this Authority, is evident from the History of the *Church* in all Ages, from the *Apostles* Days to this Time. The Canons of the *Church*, from the most early Ages to this Day, are most convincing Evidences, that all the *Fathers* who made those *Canons* were of this Opinion: For all those *Canons*, tho' made by several Men, in distant Ages, and distant Places, are so many Testimonies of this Power of Binding and Loosing Sinners, being many of them only so many Rules to direct *Bishops* and their *Presbyters* in the Use and Exercise

Mat. xxviii 20.

eteiſe of this Power. All the Fathers alſo, even the moſt Primitive, who liv'd neareſt to the *Apoſtles* Days, and whoſe Writings have continued to our Times, have taken notice of this Power. It would be tedious to give you the Particulars of what they ſay, even before Popery came into the World, relating to this Authority of Binding and Looſing, of Remitting and Retaining Sins, in that manner as St. *Paul* did by the Inceſtuous *Corinthian*, whom he deliver'd to *Satan* for the Deſtruction of the Fleſh, and after freed from that Bond, that his Spirit might be ſaved in the Day of the Lord *Jeſus*; which we now call by the Name of *Church-Cenſures*, *Penance*, and *Abſolution*.

[However, I cannot forbear to give you one Inſtance of the Exerciſe of this Power on one of the greateſt of the *Roman* Emperors, becauſe it is mention'd and approv'd by our Church, in the ſecond part of the *Homily* of the *Right Uſe of the Church*.

Theodoſius the Great, who was Emperor of *Rome*, having been moſt highly provoked by the Inhabitants of *Theſſalonica*, who had tumultuouſly murder'd one of his Generals, iſſued out a ſevere Order for their Puniſhment, which was executed with the utmoſt Rigour. For the Officers who were appointed to ſee this Execution done, came, as it were, peaceably to the City, and having invited the Inhabitants, to all appearance, in a friendly manner, to ſee ſome fine Shows, which they pretended they would exhibit to them: Having gotten by this means a great Multitude into the *Circ*, or Place erected for publick Shows and Sports, they brought a Band of Soldiers upon them, and put all to the Sword, without diſtinction of Age or Sex, and going into the City alſo, ſlew all they could find, whether Strangers or Inhabitants; ſo that in the ſpace of three Hours they deſtroyed Seven

Vid. *Vit. Ambroſij per Baronium ex Theod.*

Thouſand Perſons: The greateſt part of which, by far, were, without diſpute, wholly innocent of the Crime. St. *Ambroſe*, who was then Biſhop of *Milan*, the Place where the Emperor at that time reſided (tho' then abſent for a little while) upon the News of this Maſſacre, which was made by his Order, immediately wrote him a Letter, repreſenting to him the Heinouſneſs of his Crime, in ſhedding ſo much innocent Blood, and for his having not taken proper Methods to diſtinguiſh the Innocent from the Guilty. And when the Emperor came to *Milan*, and wou'd have come into the Church there, St. *Ambroſe* met him at the Porch, and ſpoke to him in this manner: "It is very pro-
"bable, O Emperor, that you know not how
"great the Slaughter is that you have made; and
"that you have not, ſince your Anger has been
"pacified, conſider'd the Fact you have committed.
"For your Imperial Majeſty, perhaps, ſuffers you
"not to acknowledge the Fault, and your Power
"darkens your Reaſon: But we ought to conſider
"how frail and wavering our Nature is, and al-
"ways to bear in mind, that we muſt return to the
"Duſt from whence we ſprung: Neither ſhould
"you be ſo far deceiv'd by the Splendour of your
"Purple, as not to know the Weakneſs of that
"Body which it covers: Alſo, that thoſe who are
"commanded by you, partake of the ſame Na-
"ture with your ſelf, and are in that reſpect your
"Fellow-Servants. For there is one Lord and
"King of All, which is God the Creator of this
"Univerſe. With what Eyes then will you look
"towards the Temple of Him, who is Lord of All?
"With what Feet will you tread on this Holy
"Ground? How will you dare reach out your
"Hands ſtained with unjuſt Murder and Blood,
"and take the Holy Body of the Lord with them?
"Or how will you take his venerable Blood into

"your

"your Mouth, with which, inſtigated by Fury, "you commanded ſo much Blood to be unjuſtly "ſhed? Go then, and attempt not by a new "Crime to encreaſe the Guilt of that Crime you "have already committed; but take this *Band*, which "the Lord of All gives Sentence that you be bound "with: This *Band* hath Force in it to repel the Diſ-"eaſe of your Mind, and to reſtore you to your Health. The Emperor, in his own Excuſe, had recourſe to the Example of *David*, who was guilty both of Adultery and Murder. To which *Ambroſe* anſwered, *Go then and follow him in his Repentance, whom you have followed in his Sin.* The Emperor immediately retir'd and bewail'd his Sin: And having continued under this Band Eight Months, when *Chriſtmas* came, he ſat weeping in his Palace; and *Ruffinus*, one of his chief Officers of State, asking the Cauſe of it, he ſaid, *Slaves and Beggars have free Admiſſion to the Temple, there to offer up their Prayers to God, but that Place and Heaven itſelf is ſhut againſt me. For I call to Mind that Sentence pronounced by our Lord, where it is ſaid, Whatſoever ye ſhall bind on Earth, ſhall be bound in Heaven.* I will go to the Biſhop, ſays *Ruffinus*, and beſeech him to abſolve you. The Emperor fearing *Ambroſe* would deny his Requeſt, was ſome time before he would give *Ruffinus* leave to go to him; however at laſt he ſent him, and alſo followed himſelf, attended with his Guards. *Ambroſe* gave *Ruffinus* a flat Denial; and then ſeeing the Emperor attended with his Guards, reproved him alſo, and told him, That his coming in that manner look'd Tyrannical, and that he ſeem'd as if he came to offer Violence to the Prieſts and to the Church. *I do not come*, ſays Theodoſius, *to oppoſe the Sacred Laws, nor to break into the Church, nor to uſe any Violence: But I beſeech you to looſe the Band wherewith you have bound me: And that you would imitate the Clemency of the Lord, who hath open'd*

the Door of Mercy to Sinners. Ambroſe reply'd, *What Penitence do you ſhew for ſo great a Crime? It is your part*, ſays Theodoſius, *to preſcribe the Remedy, and mine to perform your Commands.* Then ſaith the Biſhop, *Make a Law, that the Execution of Imperial Sentences, which relate to the ſhedding Blood, ſhall be deferr'd thirty Days, that the Anger of the Emperor may have Time to cool, and he may conſider before Execution, whether his Orders are juſt or unjuſt.* The Emperor conſented, and immediately enacted this Law, and ſign'd it with his own Hand. And as ſoon as this was done, *Ambroſe* abſolved him. Then they went into the Church, where the Emperor caſt himſelf proſtrate on the Floor, repeating thoſe Words of David, *My Soul cleaveth to the Duſt: O quicken thou me according to thy Word.*

Pſal. cxix. 25.

Then the Time coming when they were to make their Offerings at the Holy Table, he aroſe weeping and lamenting his Sin, as he had done before upon the Ground: And coming into the Chancel, he went, as he had been accuſtomed to do, and made his Offering at the Altar, and ſtaid within the Rails. But again the Great *Ambroſe* call'd to him, and ask'd him if he wanted any thing? The Emperor ſaid, He waited to receive the Holy Myſteries. Then *Ambroſe* ſent his *Arch-deacon* to him, to acquaint him that the Place within the Rails was only for the Prieſts, and therefore deſired him to go out, and receive with the reſt of the People. *For the Purple*, ſays he, *makes Emperors, but does not make Prieſts.* The faithful Emperor obey'd the Admonition, and anſwered, That he did not ſtay in that Place out of any Preſumption, but had been accuſtomed to do ſo at *Conſtantinople*: Therefore, ſays he, *I thank you for this Inſtruction.* And when he return'd to *Conſtantinople*, which was the Seat of his Empire, and came to receive the Communion, after he had made his Offering, according to Cuſtom,

ſtom, he went out of the Rails again. And when *Nectarius*, who was Biſhop of that Church, ask'd him, Why he did not ſtay within the Rails, as he had been us'd to do formerly? He anſwer'd with a Sigh, and ſaid, *I have at laſt, though with much Difficulty, learn'd the Difference between a Biſhop and an Emperor. I at laſt found a Maſter that has taught me the Truth. For* Ambroſe *is the only Biſhop I know that is worthy of that Name.*

It is obſervable that there was no ſuch thing as *Popery* in the World, when St. *Ambroſe* exercis'd this Authority, of Binding and Looſing upon this Great and Good Emperor. For I may well call him Good Emperor, ſince except this one Inſtance of Cruelty, to which he had very great Provocation, and to which he was inſtigated by the continued Importunities of his Great Councellors, no Prince ever govern'd with more Clemency; and he teſtified a moſt ſincere, hearty Penitence for this Act, and made the beſt Amends for it to his Subjects, by publiſhing that equitable Law abovementioned. But it is evident, there was no *Popery* in the World at that time: For if the Emperor had ever heard of ſuch a thing as a *Biſhop* of *Biſhops*, ſuch as the *Pope* pretends to be, and has done ever ſince what we call *Popery* has appear'd, he would immediately have applied to him, to have been looſed from that *Band* wherewith *Ambroſe* had bound him: And being ſo near to *Rome* too, would not have waited eight Months under the continued Fears of Damnation, if he ſhould happen to die before he was abſolv'd, without making any Applications there for Pardon. It is therefore certain that he knew, that neither the *Pope*, nor any other ſingle *Biſhop* had the Power to looſe that *Band*, which his own *Dioceſan* had put upon him: And that the *Biſhop* of *Rome* pretended not at that time to any ſuch Power, or at leaſt that no ſuch Power was gene-

generally thought to belong to him. Neither was he a Prince that had been uſed to be *Prieſt-ridden*, according to a Modern Phraſe, for he had lived the moſt part of his Time (after he was Emperor at leaſt) at *Conſtantinople*, where *Nectarius* was Biſhop, who appears by the Story to have been one that was by no means like *Ambroſe*, but according to *Socrates*, was of an exceeding fair, plauſible Demeanour, and affected Popularity, and therefore would give no Offence to any by the Exerciſe of his Authority; for which *Theodoſius*, after his Return from *Milan*, gave him a handſome Rebuke, when he invited him to come within the Rails, by letting him know. *That* Ambroſe *alone deſerv'd the Name of a Biſhop*: Which was a civil way of telling him that he deſerved it not. In ſhort, it appears, That *Theodoſius* was a good Chriſtian; and as ſoon as he met a Biſhop, who had the Courage to teach him his Duty, and to let him know the Authority he had to *bind and looſe, to remit or retain Sins*, he ſubmitted to the *Band*, teſtified his Repentance in the manner the Biſhop preſcrib'd to him, and humbly begged for Abſolution. Another thing which clears this Act of St. *Ambroſe* from any thing like *Popery*, is, that when he excommunicated the Emperor, he pretended not in the leaſt thereby to diminiſh his Civil Authority, he own'd him ſtill to be his Sovereign, and that his Subjects every one of them ow'd him the ſame Allegiance as before: During the eight Months he lay under this Cenſure, he exerciſed his Imperial Authority, and enjoyed his State, and was attended by his Guards, as he had been formerly. He was the ſame in all reſpects as to his Imperial Capacity as he had been. Whereas *Popiſh* Excommunications pretend to affect the Civil Rights of thoſe, on whom they are inflicted: The *Pope* pretends to depoſe Princes, abſolve

Lib. v. cap. 8.

Sub-

Subjects from their Allegiance, and to give away their Dominions to whom they pleaſe. But nothing of this was done by St. *Ambroſe*, his Cenſure purely related to the Emperor's Soul. If there had been any thing *Popiſh* in this Act, the Compilers of our Homilies (who were as firm Proteſtants as ever this Nation had) would not have ſpoke of it with Approbation. And thoſe Homiles being confirmed by our Articles, is a Teſtimony, That this Act was agreeable to the preſent Doctrine of our Church, and conſequently that our Biſhops have the Authority which St. *Ambroſe* exerciſed, and by the Law of God may execute it, when there is juſt Occaſion, even upon the Greateſt; there being no Perſon on Earth ſo great as to be exempted from this Power. As all Perſons, of what Quality ſoever, are to be admitted into *Chriſt*'s Church by the ſame Ordinance; ſo are they liable to be caſt out of it in the ſame Manner: For, God is no Reſpecter of Perſons.]

And that our Church conceives her *Prieſts* to be veſted with the ſame Authority which the *Apoſtles*, and their Succeſſors the *Biſhops* and *Prieſts* in the Primitive Church did exerciſe, in this particular part of *Remitting and Retaining Sins*, is evident, not only from the allowed Practice in the Spiritual Courts to Cenſure and Abſolve, which by reaſon of the Abuſes there too frequent, are not now much regarded, but from our very Liturgy, or Book of Common-Prayer. When a *Prieſt* is Ordained, the *Biſhop* laying his Hands upon him (as the *Apoſtles*, and Primitive Biſhops did on thoſe they Ordained, ſays, *Receive the* Holy Ghoſt, *for the Office and Work of a* Prieſt *in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the Impoſition of our Hands. Whoſe ſins thou doſt forgive, they are forgiven; and whoſe ſins thou doſt retain, they are retained.* And in our Daily Service it is expreſſed, That *God hath given*

Power

Power and Commandment to his Miniſters, not only *to declare*, but *to pronounce to his People, being penitent, the Abſolution and Remiſſion of their Sins.* And in the Office for viſiting the Sick, it is ordered, *That the ſick Perſon ſhall be mov'd to make a ſpecial Confeſſion of his Sins, if he feel his Conſcience troubled with any weighty Matter. After which Confeſſion, the* Prieſt *ſhall abſolve him, (if he humbly and heartily deſire it) after this ſort. Our Lord* Jeſus Chriſt, *who hath left Power to his Church to abſolve Sinners who truly repent and believe in him, of his great Mercy forgive thee thine Offences: And by his Authority committed to me, I abſolve thee from all thy Sins, In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt.*

Thus you may ſee plainly, That the *Power* and *Authority* to forgive Sins, ſtill reſides in the *Prieſts* of God's Church. That this is no *Popiſh* Doctrine, but the Doctrine of *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles*, of the *Fathers* of the Primitive Church, of our firſt Reformers who compiled our Liturgy, and died Martyrs for the *Proteſtant Religion.* It is the Doctrine of the Liturgy itſelf, which has been confirmed by ſeveral Synods or Convocations of the Biſhops and Clergy of this Church, and by ſeveral Parliaments of this Realm. To ſay therefore that *God's Prieſts* have not this Power, is to ſay, That *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles*, the Fathers and Martyrs of the Primitive Church and our own, our Convocations and our Parliaments, were all miſtaken; which I hope you will not raſhly do. Therefore, I will ſhew,

III. *Thirdly*, How uſeful and expedient it is, That there ſhould be ſuch a Power in the Church, and the great Benefit it may be to the People, if rightly uſed and applied. Now we
Pſal. li. v. know that we are all *conceived and born*
Eph. ii. 3. *in ſin*, That we *are by Nature the Children*

of

of Wrath; ſo that *if we* ſhould *ſay we have no Sin, we* do but *deceive our ſelves, and the Truth is not in us.* We know alſo that *the Wages of Sin is Death:* So that a Sentence of *Death is paſſed upon all Men, for that all have ſinned.* And that the Conſequence of this Death in Sin, is *the Damnation of Hell.* We may be ſatisfied alſo from the Scriptures, that there is no way for us to eſcape this Damnation, but by the Forgiveneſs of our Sins. For 'till our Sins are pardoned, God will not be reconciled to us. *But being made free from Sin, and become Servants to God, ye have your fruit unto Holineſs, and the end everlaſting Life.* The Word of God then plainly teaches us, that 'till we are freed from our Sins, there is no Hope for us, either that we ſhall eſcape Eternal Death, or be made Partakers of Everlaſting Life. But I will not uſe many Words to prove, what none that pretend to believe the Scriptures can deny, which is, that *there muſt be a Remiſſion of Sins, or elſe there is no Hopes of Happineſs in Heaven, or of avoiding the Damnation of Hell.* For *Chriſt*, who came to conquer and deſtroy Death and the Devil, and to deliver us out of their Power and Dominion, and to purchaſe Salvation for us, has done this, by *ſaving us from our Sins:* For that, we are told, was the End for which he came into the World. This is a Benefit which every one muſt acknowledge to be very great and extraordinary; a Benefit, without which, no other Bleſſing could have been obtained for us.

1 Joh. i. 8. Rom. vi. 23. Rom. v. 12. Mat. xxiii. 33. Rom. vi. 22. Mat. i. 21.

But what ſignifies a General Pardon, unleſs Means are vouchſafed for the Application of it to every particular Man? Or what is the Advantage of the bare Promiſe of a Pardon, without any

Means by which that Pardon may be ſealed and ratified? We are exhorted to *repent and be converted, that our Sins may be blotted out*: But our Repentance and Converſion cannot blot out our Sins. They are indeed the Conditions of the Covenant to be performed on our part, to qualifie us to receive the Forgiveneſs of our Sins, and therefore they are neceſſary for us; and we muſt be ſorry for our Offences, and turn from our evil Ways, or elſe we ſhall not be forgiven: But the Pardon and Forgiveneſs it ſelf is no Act of ours, but of God only; and for this reaſon, how well ſoever we may be qualified to receive a Pardon, we cannot aſſure our ſelves that we actually are pardon'd, 'till we can ſome way or other be aſſured, that GOD has particularly forgiven Us.

Act. iii. 19.

But now which way can we be aſſured of this, unleſs God would vouchſafe to call to every particular Man by a Voice from Heaven, and ſay unto him, *Son, thy Sins be forgiven thee*; which would be below the Dignity of his Incomprehenſible Majeſty and Greatneſs? Or elſe, that he ſhould appoint certain Perſons as his Stewards or Deputies, to declare and pronounce this Remiſſion of Sins, in his Name, to every Perſon being penitent? And this, I have ſhewed you, *Chriſt* actually did do in the Words of the Text, ſaying, *Whoſe ſoever Sins ye remit, they are remitted: And whoſe ſoever Sins ye retain, they are retained.* By which means Men may be encouraged to *repent and be converted*, not only in Hopes or with a Proſpect of having their Sins forgiven in another Life, but may alſo have their Pardon ſo confirmed and ratified even in this Life, that they ſhall not have the leaſt cauſe to doubt, but that it is alſo at the ſame time confirmed and ratified in Heaven. For ſo is our Saviour's

Promiſe, *Whatſoever ye ſhall bind on Earth, ſhall be bound in Heaven: And whatſoever ye ſhall looſe on Earth, ſhall be looſed in Heaven.* Mat. xviii. 18. You ſee here the Pardon begins on Earth; and what is done here Below by the *Servant*, the *Maſter* himſelf ratifies and confirms Above.

And to convince us that he hath made as full and ample Deputation of his own Power to forgive Sins, as was poſſible to be given to Men, *Chriſt* uſeth no other Word to denote the Power committed to the Apoſtles, than he does to denote that Power which was inherent in himſelf. For he does not ſay, *Whoſe Sins* ye wiſh, or pray for, or *whoſe Sins* ye declare to be *remitted*; but, *whoſe Sins ye remit*: Uſing the very ſame Expreſſion with regard to the Apoſtles, which he uſeth with regard to Himſelf.

It is alſo further obſervable, That he ſays not, *Whoſe Sins ye remit*, I will *remit*, or they ſhall be *remitted*; but, *Whoſe ſoever Sins ye remit, they are remitted*: Plainly intimating thereby, that whatſoever they ſhall do according to this Commiſſion, ſhall have an immediate Effect and Validity. That at the very ſame time that his Miniſters pronounce Abſolution to the Penitent, or ſeal to them the Pardon and Forgiveneſs of their Sins, by the Miniſtration of his Holy Sacraments, he himſelf actually forgives them: And thoſe who rightly and duly receive theſe Holy Ordinances, have not a bare Aſſurance or Promiſe to be forgiven hereafter, but are really and truly forgiven at that very time: Their Pardon is actually ſealed, and they are made one with *Chriſt*, and *Chriſt* with them.

And what can be more beneficial than this? Can any thing be more advantageous to us, than to have an Aſſurance that our Sins not only ſhall be forgiven, but that they actually are ſo? For when a Man has God's Pardon and Forgiveneſs thus

particularly applied and ſeal'd to himſelf, in that Method which God had preſcrib'd in his Holy Word, he has then the moſt comfortable Aſſurance, founded on the Infallibility of God's faithful Promiſes, that he ſhall be ſav'd; Becauſe we know, that nothing but our Sins can exclude us from Heaven; and therefore if our Sins are pardon'd, our Salvation is ſecure. The Man then who has receiv'd *Remiſſion of his Sins*, by the Miniſtration of the *Prieſt*, to whom *Chriſt* himſelf committed the Power to remit Sins, can, if he is at any time tempted to doubt of his Salvation, comfort himſelf with a ſtedfaſt Aſſurance, that God never fails to ratifie his own Ordinances, and ſuch Miniſtrations as are perform'd by virtue of a Commiſſion given by him. Becauſe, by maintaining the Honour and Authority of his Servant, who acts no otherwiſe than he has empower'd him to do, God really and truly ſupports and maintains his own Honour, which we know he is always jealous of, and will not ſuffer to be deſpiſed or contemned. The Good Chriſtian may therefore comfort himſelf with ſuch Contemplations as theſe; and when he lies under any Temptation to doubt of his future State, let him ſay,

I have been admitted into Covenant with God, by receiving the Seals of the Covenant from the Hands of his Miniſter, whom he appointed to tranſact with me in his Name. I was baptized by him in my Infancy, for the Remiſſion of my Sins, and ſo my Original Guilt was waſhed away. I have every *Lord's-Day*, or oft'ner, upon the humble Confeſſion of my Sins, receiv'd from him the Benefit of Abſolution. I have frequently renew'd my Covenant at the Lord's Table, and there receiv'd the Body of *Chriſt* which was broken, and his Blood which was ſhed for the Remiſſion of my Sins. Thus have *Chriſt*'s Merits and *God*'s Mercy been particularly apply'd to me, by his Subſtitute

or

or Deputy, whom *Chriſt* himſelf has ſent with Power and Authority to remit Sins, even as he was ſent by the Father for that Purpoſe. So that having thus receiv'd the Remiſſion of my Sins in particular, by God's *Prieſt*, to whom he *has given the Miniſtry of Reconciliation*, I have no more Reaſon to doubt of my Pardon's being ſealed in Heaven, than if an *Angel* deſcended from thence to tell me ſo. For what is an *Angel* but the *Meſſenger of the Lord of Hoſts*? And ſo, the Scriptures tells us, is the *Prieſt*. An *Angel* can no more *forgive ſins* than a *Man*. He can but tell us what God does by his Miniſtration, and ſo may the *Prieſt*.

2 Cor. v. 18.

Mal. ii. 7.

And now let me intreat you to lay this Matter ſeriouſly to Heart. Conſider with your ſelves, that barely to abſtain from the Pollutions and Corruptions of the World, and to pray to God never ſo heartily, ſaying, *Lord have Mercy upon me a Sinner*, is not ſufficient, according to the Promiſes of God, to pardon your Sins: It may qualifie you to receive Pardon, but it does not actually pardon you, tho' you join to it never ſo full a Truſt and Confidence in the Merits of *Jeſus Chriſt*: But thoſe Merits, and this Pardon muſt be applied to you in the way that he has preſcrib'd in his Holy Goſpel, by the Miniſtry of thoſe to whom he has given Power on Earth to remit Sins by *Abſolution*, and the Miniſtration of the *Holy Sacraments*. We cannot ſay that God will not forgive Sins any other way but this: He may forgive and pardon, even as he pleaſes himſelf: But this is the way that he has preſcribed in his Goſpel, and therefore howſoever he may remit the Sins of ſuch (if there be any ſuch) as have not Opportunity to make uſe of theſe Means of Grace, we have no reaſon to think he will be merciful to thoſe who ſlight and deſpiſe them:

them: Or that he will pardon the Sins of those who will not accept of his Pardon, according to the Methods which he has ordained and appointed. Therefore, since he has appointed an Order of Men to forgive your Sins in his Name, as his Deputies or Stewards, do not condemn this Ordinance, but thankfully accept God's Pardon in his own Way, and by those Means which he has prescribed.

Do not say within your selves, I can never believe that a Man who is perhaps as great a Sinner as my self can forgive my Sins. For it is not the Man that forgives, it is not the Man that pardons you, but God himself does it by the Ministry of his *Priest*, who is the *Ambassador for Christ*, and appointed *in Christ's stead to reconcile you to God.* If the Man be wicked and naughty, his Commission is not therefore naught: And what he does by virtue of his Commission, shall stand good and firm, whatsoever becomes of himself. *For*, as St. *Paul* says, *if he do this thing willingly, he has a Reward; but if against his Will, yet the Dispensation is committed to him.* And we have all just Cause to be thankful that it is so: For if the Authority was to have any Dependance on the Piety and Vertue of the Man, we could never be satisfied in this Matter. But since the Authority depends on the Commission only, we may be easily satisfied in this Point, and rest assured that the Man may be an Instrument to save others, though he himself should be a Cast-away. Let us be thankful to GOD, who has left a Power on Earth to forgive Sins, whereby every Man upon the Earth, may more easily find the Means to obtain Pardon and Forgiveness. And let me entreat you to make a right Use of these Means

2 Cor. v. 20.

2 Cor. ix. 17.

of

of Grace, by an early bringing your Children to Baptiſm, that the Original Sin they have contracted by their Conception and Birth, and which is derived to them from our Firſt Parents, may be waſhed away in that Laver of Regeneration. Come yourſelves humbly and devoutly to receive the Daily Abſolution, after the Confeſſion of your Sins: † And if, upon Examination of your Conſciences, you find your ſelves guilty of particular Sins, which may require a particular Repentance, you ought then to go to the *Prieſt* in private, and make a particular Confeſſion, and deſire a particular *Abſolution.* Alſo fail not, as often as you have Opportunity, to partake of the Body of *Chriſt* which was broken, and of his Blood which was ſhed for *the Remiſſion of Sins:* And when you have faithfully done thus, you need not doubt but your Sins which are ſo remitted on Earth, according to God's Ordinances, are alſo *remitted in Heaven.* Which GOD of his Mercy grant that all our Sins may be, thro' *Jeſus Chriſt our Lord*, &c.

---

† *See the Exhortation to the Holy Communion.*

F I N I S.

An *Advertiſement* relating to two Paſſages in this SERMON.

SInce the firſt Edition of this Sermon, I find there are Two Paſſages which I conceive to need ſome Explanation, and which I therefore take this Opportunity to clear, and ſet in the true Light.

The firſt is p. 23. l. 1. *I have ſaid, That* it was in vain for any one ſo bound (*viz. whoſe Sins were bound upon him*) to expect a Pardon from *Chriſt* in Heaven, till he had receiv'd Abſolution from the *Apoſtle* that had bound him, *&c. I purpoſely made uſe of the Word* Apoſtle *in this Place, as denoting a Perſon of the higheſt Order in the Church, which we now call the Order of* Biſhops; *and if ſuch a one bind, I conceive no other ſingle Perſon can looſe: But I never meant (as I perceive ſome have miſunderſtood me) that the Biſhop could not releaſe whom the* Prieſt *ſhould bind, and therefore uſed not the Word* Prieſt *on this Occaſion, but* Apoſtle *or* Biſhop. *But tho' no ſingle* Biſhop *could releaſe what another* Biſhop *had bound (except his Succeſſor in caſe of his Death or Tranſlation) yet the College or Synod of* Biſhops *might do it. For we find,* Act. xv. *an Appeal was made by the Church of* Antioch, *from* Paul *and* Barnabas *to the Apoſtolical College at* Jeruſalem, *in a Point of Doctrine; therefore much more might ſuch Appeals be made in point of Diſcipline. And accordingly the Primitive Church ever allowed of ſuch Appeals.*

The other Paſſage is in the laſt Page of the Sermon, where I ſay, If upon Examination of your Conſciences, you find your ſelves guilty of particular Sins, *&c. By which Words I underſtand ſome Perſons think I would introduce* Auricular Confeſſion, *which I am ſure was ever very far from my Thoughts: For I meant no more by* particular Sins, which might need a particular Repentance, *than ſuch Sins as ought to burthen a Man's Conſcience to that degree, that he cannot quiet it without farther Comfort or Counſel, as it is expreſſed in the Exhortation to the Holy Communion, to which I there refer the Reader. And I ſhould have Printed that Paſſage in the very Words of that Exhortation, had I not been obliged (as I ſaid in my Preface) to print it as I preach'd it.*

6 A 58

The Christian Altar and Sacrifice.

A

SERMON,

Shewing that the

LORD'S TABLE IS A *PROPER ALTAR*,

And the

Sacrament of the Eucharist *PROPER SACRIFICE.*

By THOMAS BRETT, LL.D. Rector of *Betteshanger* in *Kent.*

Sacra Eucharistia est Convivium quoddam Fœderale (qualia etiam antiqua fuerunt Sacrificia) inter Deum & Homines. Homines enim primo offerunt Panem & Vinum Deo, quas Creaturas sibi oblatas & in Symbola magni per Christum peracti Sacrificii consecratas, Deus iterum hominibus impertit; quo pacto ipsi per fidem de magno Christi Sacrificio revera participant. Bevereg. Cod. Can. Vindicat. lib. 2. cap. 10. §. 4.

LONDON: Printed for J. WYAT, at the *Rose* in St. *Paul's Church-Yard.* 1713.

THE PREFACE.

ABout ſeven Years ago came forth an impious Book, without either Author or Bookſeller's Name affix'd to it; which under the ſpecious Title of *The Rights of the Chriſtian Church aſſerted*, endeavoured (as far as the Malice and pretended Wit of the Author was able) to overthrow all the Rights, Power and Authority which our Saviour had given to his Church. This Book, together with ſome others publiſh'd about that time, gave a juſt Alarm to thoſe who had a true Zeal for that Religion which our Saviour Eſtabliſh'd, which his Apoſtles and their Succeſſors preached and propagated in all the World, which the Biſhops and Paſtors of the Primitive Church maintain'd and ſupported with the hazard of their Lives, which the Martyrs and Confeſſors ſealed with their Blood; and which, when it had ſhamefully been corrupted by the Church of *Rome*, the excellent Reformers of this Church, had to the beſt of their Ability, reſtor'd to its primitive Purity.

Hereupon the very Learned and Reverend Dr. *Potter*, at that time Domeſtick Chaplain to his Grace my Lord Archbiſhop

of *Canterbury*, wrote and publiſh'd his excellent *Diſcourſe of Church-Government*; which being written in his Grace's Family, I doubt not was written alſo by his Direction, and publiſhed with his Approbation: For had that Book contained what was contrary to his *Grace's Sentiments*, I cannot think he would have thought the Author to have merited thoſe Preferments, which have ſince been ſo deſervedly conferred upon him. I cannot think that his Grace, whoſe Intereſt was at that time very great, would have permitted a Perſon, tho' his own Domeſtick, to have been advanced to the Divinity-Chair of the Univerſity of *Oxford*, if he had publiſhed any thing which *in his Grace's Opinion* had been Heterodox, or contrary to the known received Doctrine of the Church of *England*.

The very Worthy and Learned Doctor maintains in his excellent Book, and proves from the Scriptures and Fathers of the three
Chap. 1. firſt Centuries, that the *Church is a Society, not a mere voluntary Society, but one whereof all Men muſt be Members, an outward and viſible Society, an univerſal Society with regard to Time and Place*: And *a Spiritual Society*, different from thoſe Civil Societies, which are govern'd by the Kings of the
Chap. 2. Earth. Then he ſhews that *Chriſt* is the Head of this Society, and governs it as God's *Vicegerent*, and as the *Mediator* of the

the *New Covenant*. That *Christ*'s Authority was *immediately from God*, and not from *any Earthly Power whatsoever*. That by vertue of this Authority as the *Supreme Head* of the *Spiritual Israel*, the Church of God, he appointed *Twelve Apostles to sit on Twelve Thrones, and to judge the Twelve Tribes of* Israel. He shews in the next Place, *That when our* Lord *left the Earth, his* Apostles *were entrusted with Authority to govern the* Christian *Church*. That is, with an Authority derived from him, and not from any *Earthly Magistrate*, and consequently must be Independent on all Civil Authority whatsoever. Afterwards he proves that there must be, and also that there is a Succession of Officers in the *Christian* Church, which shall continue to the end of the World, who derive their Spiritual Power and Authority from *Christ*, and not from the Civil Magistrate, even as the Apostles did.

Mat. xix. 28.

Chap. 3.

Chap. 4.

This very Learned Gentleman has given us *an Account of the Constitution, Government, and Rights of the Christian Church, chiefly as they are described by the Scriptures, and the Fathers of the three first Centuries; whose sense*, as he *assures us, he has represented, for the most part, in their own Words to avoid Mistakes*. It being, as he also well observes, *the best Method of discovering the genuine Sense of the Scriptures, to compare*

See his Preface.

them with the Practice of the first Christians, who had far better opportunity of acquainting themselves with the Judgment of the Apostles, than we can pretend to at this distance; and can't generally be supposed in those Times of Danger and Persecution, when there was no Motive to profess Christianity but the preserving a good Conscience, to have wilfully corrupted or deviated in any respect from the Divine Oracles.

The main Design and Scope of the Author of this excellent Book, is to shew that the Rights and Powers of the Church are derived immediately from *Christ*, conferred by him on his own Officers independent on the Civil Magistrate. And in treating of the Powers of the Church, having occasion
p. 270. to speak of the *Lord's Supper*, he shews that it is called *an Oblation, a Sacrifice and a Gift.* Also in explaining the Nature of
p. 349. the Power of the Keys, he shews that *it signifies Authority to* Condemn *Men for their Sins, or* Absolve *them.*

Now when we poor Country Priests saw these Doctrines so clearly asserted and maintained, by a Person of so much Worth and Learning; saw them so Learnedly, Judiciously and Solidly proved from the Scriptures and most primitive Fathers; when we saw this done also by the Domestick Chaplain of my Lord Archbishop of *Canterbury*; and likewise saw this very Person, by his Grace's

Interest

Intereſt advanced to the Divinity-Chair in one of our Univerſities, the moſt unfit Station for a Man that had maintained any Opinions contrary to the receiv'd Doctrines of this Church; could we, I ſay, when we ſaw all this, imagine that theſe were Heterodox Doctrines, or that we ſhould offend in Preaching ſuch Things? Could we think that our Superiours, who had taken particular care to ſee this Worthy Gentleman prefer'd to ſo important a Charge ſoon after his publication of this Book, without requiring him to explain, change, or mollify any one Paſſage in it, ſhould not be of the ſame Opinion with him in theſe Points? Could we ſuſpect that theſe Doctrines, which this Learned Author had ſo fully proved to be moſt agreeable to the Doctrine of the Scriptures and of the Primitive Church, ſhould as ſoon as preached or publiſhed *by ſome others*, be accounted no better than *Modern Innovations?* Could we conceive that what in this excellent Book had been ſo evidently ſet forth, as the Doctrine of *Chriſt* and and his Apoſtles, ſhould as ſoon as preach'd by ſome of us, be cried out upon as contrary to the Doctrine of our Church, and *favouring of Popery?* Had we not reaſon to think the Doctrine contain'd in this Book to be Right and Orthodox, when we ſaw the Author of it prefer'd to ſuch a Station immediately after the Publication, as was

moſt unſuitable for one that entertain'd any Heterodox Opinions? And yet, no ſooner did others preach and publiſh theſe very Doctrines which had been ſo learnedly and ſolidly proved by this worthy Profeſſor, who at the time of writing it was his Grace's Domeſtick, but we had Charge upon Charge, at our Viſitations, cenſuring and condemning theſe very Doctrines *as favouring of Popery, and inconſiſtent with the declared eſtabliſhed Doctrines of our Church*: And Pamphlets upon Pamphlets have been publiſhed by ſome who pretend to be at leaſt Presbyters of the Church of *England*, full of trifling Arguments againſt them, charging them as *Popiſh* and *Modern*, without any one ſolid Proof that they are ſo.

Amongſt the reſt, the Doctrine contained in the following Sermon has met with very great Oppoſition; and tho' nothing can be more oppoſite to *Popery*, and the Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*, than this Doctrine of *the repreſentative Sacrifice in the Euchariſt*; yet is it continually charged by the Gainſayers as Introductive of that very Doctrine which it ſo directly oppoſes, and which it is utterly inconſiſtent with. *A very Learned Divine*, as the Author of the Propitiatory Oblation in the Euchariſt has obſerv'd, *has been ſometimes ſlily pointed at, ſometimes in Words at length reproached, for being enclined to Popery, becauſe*

p. 1.

he

he had freely declared his Mind to this Purpose. His Adversary is not content to hint this Suspicion once or twice, but repeats it almost twenty Times in one Book consisting of little more than 200 *Pages.* And yet this very Learned Divine, Dr. *Hickes*, has written as solidly and judiciously against Popery, both before and since his entring into this Controversy, as any Man whatsoever: And has also prevented some Persons from being perverted to the abominably corrupted Church of *Rome*, which I am persuaded is more than his Adversary can pretend to have done. But what will not Men do to serve a Cause and a Party they have espoused? They know *Popery* is justly terrible to all good *Protestants*, and therefore hope if they do but loudly cry out *Popery*, *Popery*, that is sufficient to confute any Doctrine they dislike.

They assert boldly, but *prove nothing at all.* They hope most People will believe their Assertions, without giving themselves the trouble to examine their false Arguments. Nay, if their pretended Arguments be never so well examined and confuted, they will repeat them again and again, as if nothing had, or could be said against them. They hope their Pamphlets will fall into the hands of some that know nothing of the Answers have been return'd to all they have, or can say; and there at least

they

they suppose their Doctrines may be imbibed. If this was not the Case, they could not tell us with such Assurance, that this Doctrine of the Eucharistical Sacrifice *is contrary to the Doctrine of our Church in her Rubricks, Canons, Homilies and Articles, and to the declared Opinion of our best Divines*; notwithstanding Dr. *Heylin* long ago, and of late Dr. *Hickes*, and the Learned Author of *the Propitiatory Oblation*, have proved this to be the plain Doctrine of this Church contained in her Liturgy. And Dr. *Heylin* has shewed that it was a Doctrine freely own'd by our best Divines, even in their Controversial Writings against the Church of *Rome*, such as Archbishop *Cranmer*, Bishop *Andrews*, and Bishop *Morton*, and that it was acknowledged by those Blessed Martyrs of this Church, *Fryth*, *Lambert*, *Philpot*, *Latymer* and *Ridley*, even at the time when they were called upon to give their Testimony to the Truth for which they suffered.

Antidot. Lincoln. p. 164, &c.

p. 101.

The Reverend and Learned Dr. *Hickes* has since shew'd it to have been the profess'd and declared Opinion of Bishop *Overal*, Bishop *Taylor*, Archbishop *Laud*, Mr. *Mede*, the Compilers of the *Scotch* Liturgy, and before them of the Compilers of the first Liturgy of the Church of *England* in the Reign of K. *Edward* VI.

Preface and Appendix to two Treatises of the Christian Priesthood and Episcopal Order, 3d Edition, viz. *Preface*, p. xxxvii. *Appendix*, p. ccxciv.

Bishop

Biſhop *Stillingfleet*, Biſhop *Bull*, Dr. *Grabe*, Dr. *Brevint*, the preſent Right Reverend and Learned Biſhop of *Sarum*, Dr. *Hammond*, Mr. *Dodwel*, Biſhop *Patrick*, Mr. *Bennet*, Mr. *Hughes*, the very Reverend and Learned Biſhop of *Lincoln*, in his Anſwer to the Biſhop of *Condom*, Biſhop *Beveridge*, and even of Mr. *Baxter* himſelf. Yet notwithſtanding ſuch a Cloud of Witneſſes have been produced upon this Occaſion, we are ſtill called upon to ſhew that any Eminent Divines of the Church of *England* have owned the *Euchariſt* to be a *Sacrifice* or *Oblation*, as if none had been already produced. Yet, although the Adverſaries to this Doctrine are able to produce no Teſtimonies of any Eminent Divines againſt us, but Dr. *Outram*, and Dr. *Cudworth*, who have each of them advanc'd particular and new Notions on this Occaſion; which have been judiciouſly and ſolidly Anſwered by Dr. *Hickes*, whoſe demonſtrative Arguments not one of his Opponents has been able to refute. They call him *Papiſt* indeed, and *Papiſtly* affected, giving hard Words according to the known Moderation of the Party, to make amends for the Weakneſs of their Reaſonings. Although not one of them is able to write ſo judiciouſly againſt *Popery*, or to Confute the Writers of the Church of *Rome*, upon the true and ſolid Principles of *Primitive Chriſtianity*, as he has excellently done. But

But now the old Queſtion may be asked, *cui Bono?* What ſignifies it to us, whether we believe the Holy Sacrament of the *Euchariſt* to be a Sacrifice or not? What need any Diſputes about it? All Parties are agreed that it is an Holy Ordinance inſtituted by *Chriſt* himſelf, and that every good Chriſtian ought to partake of it.

But we may ask again if it be not convenient, nay neceſſary that all thoſe who partake of this Holy Sacrament, ſhould underſtand and know what it is they do? Ought they not to be inſtructed in the Nature and Deſign of it, leſt *they Eat and Drink unworthily, not diſcerning the Lord's Body?* And how ſhall they *diſcern the Lord's Body*, if they are not taught that the *Lord's Body* is there preſent? For if the *Lord's Body* is not there preſent, it can be no fault in any one not to diſcern it there: It can be no fault in a Man not to diſcern what is not. But St. *Paul* expreſly declares that he who does *not diſcern the Lord's Body* in the Holy Communion of Bread and Wine, *eateth and drinketh unworthily*, nay, *eateth and drinketh damnation to himſelf*: Conſequently according to St. *Paul*'s Doctrine, *not to diſcern the Lord's Body in the Euchariſt* is a very great Sin. The Lord's Body therefore is moſt certainly to be diſcerned or ſeen in this Holy Communion, otherwiſe not to diſcern or ſee it there, could not render a Man li-

1 Cor. xi. 29.

able

able to Damnation or Judgment, underſtand the Word in as moderate a Senſe as can be put upon it.

The next Queſtion then is, How is the Lord's Body there to be diſcerned? It cannot be meant of the literal, natural Body of the Lord, as the Church of *Rome* blaſphemouſly teaches; for St. *Paul* himſelf calls it *Bread* and *Wine* even at the very time it is to be eaten and drank. *Let a Man examin himſelf*, ſays he, *and ſo let him eat of that Bread, and drink of that Cup.* How then can the *Lord's Body* be there diſcerned otherwiſe than by Repreſentation? For if it be ſtill *Bread* and *Wine*, even at the very time it is to be eaten and drank, as St. *Paul* plainly declares it to be, and yet the *Body* and *Blood* of *Chriſt* is there alſo to be *diſcern'd* or ſeen, as the ſame Apoſtle alſo teaches, then muſt the *Bread* and *Wine* fully and perfectly repreſent the *Body* and *Blood* of *Chriſt*, and we muſt believe it to do ſo, and diſcern or ſee it by the Eye of Faith, that is, by that Belief which is founded on the Word of God.

In the laſt Place then, we are to enquire how the *Body* and *Blood* of *Chriſt* is there repreſented? And it is evident from the Scriptures, that it is not the whole *Chriſt*, Body, Soul, and Divinity Hypoſtatically United, as the Papiſts alſo blaſphemouſly teach; and from thence as blaſphemouſly infer

infer that it is to be Worſhipped. That which is repreſented in the *Euchariſt* is neither the *Divinity*, nor the *Human Soul* of *Chriſt*, but only his *Body* and *Blood* ſeparated from both, and from one another. The Blood is not repreſented by the Element of Wine, as in the Body, but as ſhed and ſeparated from it; which is utterly irreconcileable with, and plainly contradictory to the Popiſh Doctrine of the Maſs, which maintains that *the whole Chriſt, Body, Soul, and Divinity is in each Species, and in every little part or portion of them*, that is, in every bit of Bread, and every drop of Wine. And for this Reaſon they miniſter this Sacrament under one only Species of Bread, becauſe, according to their Doctrine, it contains the whole. But the Scripture teaches us otherwiſe. Our Saviour at his Inſtitution of this Sacrament, gave the Bread and Wine as repreſenting his Body broken, and his Blood ſhed, or poured out from it. *This is my Body which is broken for you, this is my Blood which is ſhed for many.* And when *Chriſt*'s real Body was broken, and his Blood ſhed, it was then ſeparated, not from his Divinity only, but from his human Soul alſo, and died and was buried. The *Bread* and *Wine* therefore repreſenting *Chriſt*'s Body as broken, and his Blood as ſhed and poured out from it, can by no means repreſent, much leſs really be, the very

Catechiſ. Trident. Part. 2 Cap. 4. Quæſt. 30.

Quæſt. 50.

1 Cor. xi. 24. Mat. xxvi 28.

very individual glorified Body of *Chriſt* now in Heaven, and Perſonally united, not only to the Human Soul, but alſo to the Divine Nature. But it plainly repreſents *Chriſt*'s Body as *given*, that is, *offered* or *ſacrificed* for us; for ſo our Lord himſelf appointed it to do, ſaying, *This is my Body which is given*, or offered *for you*. It is evident therefore from the very Inſtitution, that the *Bread* and *Wine* in the Holy Sacrament of the *Euchariſt*, repreſent *Chriſt*'s Body and Blood as *given*, *offered* or *ſacrificed* for us; and are ſo full and perfect Repreſentatives thereof, that our Lord himſelf thought fit to give to the Bread and Wine, the Name of *His Body and Blood*. The Conſequence of all this is, That the *Bread* and *Wine* in the *Holy Euchariſt* doe by the very Inſtitution repreſent the Sacrifice of *Chriſt*'s Body broken, and his Blood ſhed; and that if we do not know and underſtand this, we cannot rightly *diſcern the Lord's Body*. For if we do not there, under the Repreſentatives of Bread and Wine, ſee by the Eye of Faith the Body and Blood of *Chriſt*, given, offer'd or ſacrificed for us, we do not diſcern the Lord's Body in that manner he has appointed: And if we do not *diſcern the Lord's Body*, we have St. *Paul*'s word for it, that we eat and drink our own Damnation. This Doctrine of the Euchariſtical Sacrifice is therefore neceſſary to be taught and under-

Luk. xxii. 19.

underſtood; ſince without it we cannot rightly *diſcern the Lord's Body*, and conſequently muſt receive it unworthily. For if the Body and Blood of *Chriſt*, as ſacrificed for us, is not underſtood to be there repreſented; it cannot be there diſcerned otherwiſe than it may be in any other Miniſtration whatſoever; and this Sacrament can no more *ſhew forth the Lord's death*, or ſacrifice of his Body and Blood, for his Death was that Sacrifice, than our common and daily Prayers. And therefore, unleſs we allow and acknowledge this Sacrament to be a Repreſentative Sacrifice, I cannot ſee what Benefit we can propoſe to receive from it. Which I think is ſufficient to ſhew the Neceſſity of Preaching this Doctrine.

Heb. XIII. 10.

We have an Altar whereof they have no Right to eat, which serve the Tabernacle.

THE Holy Apostle having shewed at large in this Epistle to the *Hebrews*, that the Law of *Moses* is antiquated, and the Obligation of it entirely abolish'd since the Coming of Christ *the Mediator of a better Covenant*; That God having appointed another Priesthood, *after the Order of Melchisedec, and not after the Order of Aaron*, the *Priesthood being changed, made of necessity a change also of the Law*; and that Christ *after he had offered one Sacrifice for Sins*, and *by that one Offering had perfected for ever them that are sanctified, for ever sat down on the right Hand of God*. Lest they should from hence infer that there is no more Priesthood upon Earth, no more Sacrifice, no more Altar, and consequently no Rites and Ordinances of Religious Worship; he lets them know in the Words of the Text, That *we have an Altar*, but such an one *whereof they have no Right to eat, which serve the Tabernacle*. And if we have an *Altar*, we must also have a *Sacrifice* or *Oblation* to be

Heb. viii. 6.

vii. 11, 12.

x. 12. 14.

offered upon that *Altar*, and *Priests* also to make or offer that Sacrifice or Oblation.

I shall not now trouble my self or you, to shew who are the true Christian Priests, or how, or by what means they derive their Priesthood from *Christ* himself by a Spiritual Generation, as *Aaron*'s Sons did from him by a natural Generation, and consequently are called of God to that Office as was *Aaron* and his Race, having already done this in another Discourse: But I will shew you from this Text, that as we have a proper Priesthood under the Gospel, so we have a proper Propitiatory Sacrifice or Oblation for our Priests to offer, and a proper Altar whereon to make that Oblation.

Sermon of the Honour of the Priesthood.

Heb. viii. 4.

vii. 11, 12.

Now by an Oblation or a Sacrifice, we understand a Reverend and Solemn Presentation of some visible material Gift, to the God we worship, and whereby we honour and acknowledge him to be God and Lord, which being so presented or offered, is afterwards to be put to no common Use, but to be disposed of, and consumed in such manner as our God has appointed. And the Place whereon we offer, present, or lay this material visible Gift or Element, is that which we therefore call the Altar; because the Element or Gift being there laid, from that Moment becomes God's peculiar Property, and is no more common, nor can after that Time be put to any ordinary

Use,

Use, unto which before it might have been applied: And whosoever after this solemn Presentation shall presume to put it to any other Use than God has directed for it, is guilty of the highest Sacrilege. And this Oblation, or solemn Presentation of the Gift or Element to God, can be made only by a *Priest*, who being *taken from among Men, is ordained for Men in things pertaining to God, that he may offer both Gifts and Sacrifices for Sin.* And if any other presume to make such an Offering, *but he that is called of God, as was* Aaron, he is guilty of the highest Presumption, and may justly fear, lest he *perish in the gainsaying of Core.*

Heb. v. 1.

Heb. v. 4.

Jud. 11.

I know indeed that by a *Sacrifice* Men commonly understand the shedding the Blood of some living Creature, and therefore suppose there can be no Sacrifice without shedding of Blood. But this is a Mistake; for tho' when living Creatures were sacrificed, their Blood was always shed; yet, if we look into the Law of *Moses*, we shall find there were Sacrifices of other things besides living Creatures, and such Offerings were accepted instead of living Creatures; as particularly, if a Man was unable to bring a Lamb, or two young Pigeons for a Sin Offering, he might bring for his Sin Offering the tenth Part of an Ephah of fine Flower. The Meat-Offerings also, which

Levit. v. 7. 11.

Levit. ii. 1. 4.

are frequently spoken of in the old Law, were to be of fine Flower, unleavened Cakes of fine Flower mingled with Oil, and baked in the Oven, and sometimes leavened Bread. And this is called *the Bread for God's Sacrifices to be offered unto him in due Season.* And this Offering of Bread was esteem'd as Holy or Sacred, and as acceptable to God, even under the *Jewish* Law, as any other Sacrifice or Oblation: For it is plainly intimated in the Law, that the offering this Bread, was as Sacred, and as high an Act of Worship as could be performed by a Priest. *Thou shalt sanctifie him therefore*, says the Lord, *for he offereth the Bread of thy God: He shall be Holy unto thee.*

Levit. vii. 13.

Numbers xxviii. 2.

Num. xxi. 8.

From hence it is evident that there may be unbloody Sacrifices as well as bloody ones: And that the unbloody Sacrifices are no less holy and acceptable to God than the others were, and of as great Worth and Dignity: If they were not, we cannot see a Reason, why, when the Holy Ghost saw it expedient to give Directions to the Priest to preserve the Dignity of his Character, as being *a chief Man among his People*, he should chuse to express the Excellency of this Dignity by his *offering the Bread of God.* If this Offering of Bread had been a less Worthy Sacrifice, than the Offering of Victims, the holy Penman would certainly have

Lev. xxi. 4.

have mentioned the offering of Victims, rather than of Bread on this Occasion, for the *Aaronical* Priests offered both: But his chusing to speak of Bread, rather than any other Oblation, is a clear Testimony that Bread was not esteem'd a less worthy Sacrifice than Rams or Bullocks.

Indeed there is no intrinsick Worth or Excellency, nor ever was, in any Sacrifice, except that one Sacrifice which *Christ*, once for all, made of himself upon the Cross. That was a Sacrifice truly expiatory and meritorious. That, had an intrinsick Value to purchase Pardon and Forgiveness, and to make full Satisfaction for the Sins of the whole World: *For it is not possible that the Blood of Bulls and of Goats, should take away Sins. But we are sanctified, through the offering of the Body of* Jesus Christ *once for all.* Heb. x. 4, 10,

Therefore the many Sacrifices under the Law were not acceptable to God, by reason of any intrinsick Value in themselves, but only as they were of his Appointment and Institution, and as they typified or represented that truly meritorious Sacrifice which *Christ*, when he came, should offer once for all. And by virtue of this Institution, and as they were appointed to typify or represent the perfect Sacrifice of *Christ*, they became acceptable and propitiatory; that is, they rendred God Merciful and Gracious,

and procured the Pardon of Sin, thro' the Merits of that Sacrifice which they were
Heb. x. 1. appointed to represent. *For the Law had only a shadow of good Things to come, and*
Col. ii. 17. *not the very Image of the Things; but the Body is of* Christ. Therefore, whether the Sacrifice was of a living Creature, whose Blood was shed on that Occasion; or whether it were only an Offering of Bread, God had an equal respect to both, so it was made according to his Institution: They were equally a shadow of Things to come, equally representative of *Christ*'s Sacrifice, being equally appointed for that purpose by God himself, and therefore equally acceptable and propitiatory; not acceptable and propitiatory in themselves, but as they were instituted to typifie the one great and meritorious Sacrifice.

One thing more to be observed on this Occasion, is, that altho' a part, and sometimes the whole of a *Jewish* Sacrifice was
Lev. viii. 31. xxiii. 9. consumed by Fire; yet this was not always done; for some Sacrifices, at least a part of them were appointed to be eaten in the Holy Place. And not only the *Priests*, but the People also were wont to eat of the Sa-
1 Sam. ix. 13. crifices. And this eating of the Sacrifice was esteem'd an act of Worship. If it had
1 Cor. viii. 4. x. 18. not, St. *Paul* would not have given us such Caution about eating Meats offered to Idols. Nay he expressly says, That *they which eat*

of

of the Sacrifices are Partakers of the Altar. From whence it plainly appears, that burning by Fire is no way essential to a Sacrifice; for that which is offered to God on his Altar, and from thence taken and eaten, is no less a proper Sacrifice than what is there consumed by Fire. I might prove this, and what I have here said with relation to Sacrifices by many more places of Scripture, and could add thereto many other Testimonies; but I conceive these are plain and clear, and I hope sufficient to give you the true Notion of a proper Sacrifice. That is a material Offering or Presentation of some visible Element to God, as an Acknowledgment that he has the Supreme Dominion over us, and that we receive all things from his Bounty and Goodness; also that by Divine Institution it bears a representative Relation to the one Great, True, and only Meritorious Sacrifice of *Christ* himself: Which Element or Gift so offered, is to be disposed of as God himself has appointed, that is, either to be burned in Whole or in Part, or to be consumed by eating in the Holy Place, as the *Jewish* Sacrifices were: For it appears evident from the Holy Scriptures, that what was offered to God, and then eaten, was as much a Sacrifice, as what was consumed by Fire. It appears also that it was not necessary that this Sacrifice or Oblation should be a living Creature, but

that Bread baked in the Oven was, when offered as God had appointed it, as proper and acceptable a Sacrifice as any Victim whatsoever.

Indeed all these legal Sacrifices are now abrogated by *Christ*, and since he offered himself once for all, we lie under no Obligation to make any of those Oblations which are enjoyned by the Law of *Moses*: They being all Types or Shadows instituted to represent that one truly Meritorious, and in its own nature Propitiatory Sacrifice which was to come in the fulness of Time; now that fulness of Time is come, are ceased of course. Those Sacrifices of the old Law were appointed to be offered at *Jerusalem* only, the Place which God chose for that purpose. For when God gave them his Law, he told them, that only *unto the Place which the Lord your God shall chuse, thither shall ye bring your Burnt-Offerings and your Sacrifices.* Therefore *Christ* also himself was Sacrificed in that Place which the Lord had chosen, and All then which was represented by those Sacrifices being accomplished, there was no more occasion for them. But altho' all those Sacrifices are ceased, does it therefore follow that we have now no Sacrifice to be offered by God's Appointment? Tho' none is now required to offer at *Jerusalem*, is no Oblation to be made any where else? Sure that Prophecy

Pſ. lxxviii 68, 69, 70.

Deut. xii. 5, 6.

must

must be fulfilled, which ſays, *From the riſing of the Sun, even to the going down of the ſame, my Name ſhall be great among the Gentiles: And in every Place Incenſe ſhall be offered unto me, and a pure* Offering: *For my Name ſhall be great among the the Heathen, ſaith the Lord of Hoſts.* But we need not rely on Prophecies only for a Proof of this Matter, Our Saviour himſelf has plainly appointed us a Sacrifice or Oblation, to be offered in his Name in all Places, according to this Prediction. For as it is recorded in the Goſpels, and St. *Paul* alſo hath taught us, *The Lord* Jeſus, *the ſame Night in which he was betrayed, took Bread: And when he had given Thanks, he brake it, and ſaid, take, eat: This is my Body which is broken for you: This DO in remembrance of me. After the ſame manner alſo he took the Cup, when he had ſupped, ſaying, This Cup is the new Teſtament in my Blood, this DO ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this Bread, and drink this Cup, ye do ſhew the Lord's death till he come.* Mal. i. 11. 1 Cor. xi. 23.

Is not this as proper a Sacrifice as any of the *Jewiſh* Sacrifices were? Here are material viſible Gifts, or Elements of Bread and Wine, offered to God by giving of Thanks, whereby he is honoured and acknowledged to be God and Lord. After which Preſentation,

tation, or solemn Offering of these Gifts or Elements, they are no more common, but must be disposed of, and consumed according as God has appointed, as the old *Jewish* Sacrifices were, and eaten in the Holy Place where they were consecrated or offered. The whole Action also bears a Relation to that great and truly meritorious Sacrifice which Christ made once for all upon the Cross, not typifying or representing what is to come, but commemorating, or setting forth the Memory of what is past; which is the Difference between their Sacrifice and ours. *Christ* was not yet come when their Sacrifices were commanded, but he was actually come, and ready to be offered, when our Sacrifice was instituted. Their Oblations therefore were Types or Representatives of what was then to be; and ours the Figure or Representative of what has been. But this by no means alters the nature of the Thing, or makes ours a less Sacrifice than theirs was. For I hope I have already satisfied you, that shedding of Blood, and burning upon the Altar, were not essential to a *Sacrifice*, there were Meat-Offerings of Bread, and Drink-Offerings of Wine, which were offered upon the Altar of the House of God. There could be no Blood shed in such Offerings. And the Meat-Offering, being of Bread, was not to be burned, but *reserved from the Fire, and eaten*

Numbers xxviii. 5. 7. Ezr. vii. 17.

Numbers xviii. 9, 10.

in

the most Holy Place. But it was not therefore the less an Offering or Sacrifice, because there was no Blood shed, nor any burning of it, for it is always called a *Meat Offering*. Nor was it of less Worth and Excellency than any of the other Sacrifices; forasmuch as God himself speaks of it as an Offering which dignified his Priests in an especial Manner. *Thou shalt sanctify him therefore*, saith the Lord, *For he offereth the Bread of thy God: He shall be Holy unto thee.* So long then as we *offer the Bread of God*, we cannot be said to want a Sacrifice. Num.xxi. 8.

Now if we minister the Holy Communion according to the Institution, as *Christ* himself ministred it, we must *offer the Bread of God:* For so *Christ* did; he first offered the Gifts or Elements of Bread and Wine, by presenting them to God and giving Thanks, thereby acknowledging his Father to be God and Lord, and also consecrated the Elements, or separated them from all common Use; so that they could not after be disposed of, otherwise than according to Divine Ordinance, and so he disposed of them, by giving them to his Disciples to eat and drink as his representative Body and Blood.

But it may perhaps be said, that this taking of Bread, and giving of Thanks did not necessarily make the Elements an Offering to God. For every time *Christ* eat and

and drank he bleſſed the Food or gave Thanks, and thereby acknowledged God to be the Lord; ſo alſo, every good Chriſtian bleſſes, or ſays Grace to his Meat: Yet this does not make our common Meals to be Oblations or Sacrifices, tho' by ſuch giving of Thanks we acknowledge God to be the Lord every time we eat. But we are to conſider that this Oblation was not made at their ſitting down to Meat, they were actually at Supper, not only ſat down to Table, but actually eating, before this ſacred Inſtitution. And there is no Queſtion to be made, but *Chriſt* had bleſſed the Meat before they began to eat; ſo that this Thankſgiving afterwards, was different and diſtinct from what was, or is uſual, at ſitting down to Meals, and of another kind. *Chriſt* took the Bread firſt, and afterwards the Cup into his Hand, and ſo raiſed them from the Table as an *Heave-Offering*, and thereby preſented them unto God, and his Bleſſing, or giving Thanks over them, was a ſolemn Conſecration or Separation of them to a Sacred Uſe; ſo that they were no longer like the other Meats upon the Table, nor to be eaten like them merely for the Nouriſhment of the Body, but appointed as the *Jewiſh* Sacrifices were, tho' in a fuller and better manner than they were, to repreſent the All-ſufficient Sacrifice of *Chriſt*, and to preſerve the Memory of his Death until

Mat. xxvi. 26.

till his ſecond Coming. *Chriſt* therefore plainly made a Sacrificial Oblation of the Bread and Wine to God, he firſt preſented them to him as an Offering, or an Acknowledgment of his Right of Dominion, as a Teſtimony that He only is Lord and God, from whoſe Bounty and Goodneſs we receive all Things, and then Conſecrated them to repreſent his own Body and Blood; and having ſo done, he diſpoſed of them to be eaten and drank, as the Sacrifices ſometimes were in the Holy Place in which the Oblation had been made. And we are commanded to DO, or make this Sacrifice or Oblation in Remembrance of him. For the Word which is here tranſlated DO, is frequently uſed in the Holy Scriptures, to ſignify the offering a Sacrifice; and even our *Engliſh* Tranſlation uſes the Word DO ſometimes in a ſacrificial Senſe, as particularly where it is written, *He ſhall DO with the Bullock as he did with the Bullock for a Sin-Offering; ſo ſhall he do with this.* That is, *He ſhall Offer the Bullock as he offered or ſacrificed the Bullock for a Sin-Offering, ſo ſhall he offer this.* Our Saviour therefore commanded us to DO this, and thereby plainly enjoyned us to make or offer a Sacrifice as he had done.

Luk. xxii. 19. *See Dr. Hick's Chriſtian Prieſthood.* p. 58, &c.

Levit. iv. 20.

Here then we have a plain and clear Inſtitution of a Chriſtian Sacrifice, and if we have

have a Sacrifice, then we must also have an Altar whereon to offer our Sacrifice. For an Altar and Sacrifice are Relatives, and the one always supposes the other. As therefore the Bread and Wine are the Sacrifice, the Holy Table on which they are laid, and where they are offered to God, must be the Christian Altar. And as the Eucharist is plainly a proper Sacrifice, not a figurative, or metaphorical one, as some pretend, but as true and real a Sacrifice or Oblation as any amongst the *Jews*; so for the same Reason our Holy Table is a true and proper Altar, and is so stiled by the Apostle in his Text. *We have an Altar of which they have no right to eat, which serve the Tabernacle.*

The very manner in which the Apostle here speaks of this Altar, plainly shews it to be real and visible, not metaphorical or figurative. For it is an Altar of which Christians have a Right to eat, but of which those who are no Christians, but serve the Tabernacle, and consequently adhere still to the old Law, as if *Christ* was not yet come in the Flesh, have no right to eat. For the saying they have no right to eat of it, whose Altar it is not, that is, the *Jews*, plainly implies, that they have a right to eat of it whose Altar it is; that is, we that are *Christians*. If any one shall say, that the Apostle here speaks of Eating and Drinking

Speaking figuratively or ſpiritually, and therefore the Altar here ſpoken of is to be underſtood in a figurative ſpiritual Senſe: I deſire him to conſider that the Bread and Wine which is offered as the Chriſtian Sacrifice, is not to be eaten figuratively or ſpiritually, but literally and really; and if that which is to be eaten from the Altar be real, literal and viſible, then the Altar from whence they are taken muſt be real, and viſible alſo, not figurative and ſpiritual. The Body and Blood of *Chriſt* are indeed ſpiritually received and eaten under the Symbols of Bread and Wine; but the Bread and Wine themſelves, which are taken from the Altar, are viſibly and literally eaten and drank, and therefore the Altar from whence they are taken muſt be as literal and viſible. Conſequently the *Chriſtian Altar*, mentioned in the Text, is a material viſible Altar, and as properly ſuch as the *Jeruſalem-Altar* it ſelf. Nor is it any Objection to ſay that ours cannot be a proper Altar, becauſe it is not of Stone, but only a Table of Wood; for the *Jewiſh* Altar was no other than *a four ſquare Table of Shittim Wood*. The difference between a Table and an Altar being only in the Uſe for which it is aſſign'd. The *Jeruſalem-Altar* it ſelf, is called in the Holy Scripture, *the Table of the Lord*. A Table differing no otherwiſe from an Altar, than another Cup from a Chalice,

Ex. xxvii. 1.

Mal. i. 7, 12.

Ezek. xliv 16. & xli. 22.

or

or an House from a Church, or a Feast from a Sacrifice: And therefore, as St. *Paul* calls the *Christian Altar* (on which the Holy Communion was Celebrated) the *Table of the Lord*; so he also called the *Heathen-Altar* (on which the Sacrifices were offer'd to Idols) the *Table of Devils*. Now if the *Christian Tables* were not assigned to the same Use with the *Heathen Tables*, that is, to receive the Oblations or Sacrifices offered to the true God of the *Christians*, as the other were to receive the Oblations or Sacrifices offered to the false Gods, or Devils worshiped by the *Heathens*; there is no Analogy in the Opposition the Apostle makes of the one to the other. Consequently if those *Heathen-Tables* were proper *Altars*, the *Christian-Tables* must be so also. In this Place also we plainly learn that the Holy Communion is the *Christian Sacrifice*, for he Opposes this Communion to the Sacrices of the *Gentiles*; therefore by the Laws of Opposition it must be a Sacrifice as they are. Also when he tells us that *we are all Partakers of that one Bread*, he proves that we are so, by shewing that among the *Jews*, all those *which eat of the Sacrifices are Partakers of the Altar*: Which would be a weak, unconclusive Argument, if the Communion of this Bread was not a Sacrifice, even as proper a Sacrifice as the *Jewish* Sacrifices were. And as the *Table of the Lord*

1 Cor. x. 21.

1 Cor. x. 17.

was

was an *Altar* to them, ſo is the *Table of the Lord* an *Altar* to us. As the *Table of Devils* was plainly the *Devil's Altar*, ſo muſt *the Table of the Lord* be as evidently *God's Altar*.

From hence I conceive it is evident, that we have a Sacrifice, and we have an Altar, as the Text teaches us, even as proper, as viſible, as material a Sacrifice as any among the *Jews* or *Gentiles*, and as viſible and material an *Altar*; for as our Offerings are viſible and material, ſo muſt our Altar alſo be. Our Church, I confeſs, does not in her preſent Rubricks call it the *Altar*, but the *Lord's Table*: However, ſince the Scripture not only calls it an *Altar*, but alſo ſhews us that the *Table of the Lord*, and the *Lord's Altar* are the ſame, we may well ſay that we alſo have an *Altar*, even according to the Doctrine of our own Church.

And as we have a Sacrifice and an Altar, ſo is it a more excellent Sacrifice than any of the *Jewiſh* Sacrifices were; for, as the Text ſays, *We have an Altar whereof they have no right to eat, which ſerve the Tabernacle.* That is, the *Jews*, who were God's choſen People, yet have no right to eat of the Chriſtian Sacrifice, becauſe it is ſuch a Sacrifice as by their own Law they were not permitted to eat of: As plainly appears from the Words following the Text. *For the Bodies of thoſe Beaſts, whoſe Blood is*

brought into the Sanctuary by the High Priest for Sin, are burnt without the Camp; wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the People with his own Blood, suffered without the Gate. By which Words the Apostle proves what he had asserted in the Text, that those *which serve the Tabernacle had no right to eat of our Altar*; Because *Christ*, whose Body and Blood is here representatively offered under the Symbols of Bread and Wine, was made an Offering for Sin, by the Law of *Moses* no one was to eat part of a *Sin-Offering*, but it was to be burnt without the Camp. If then by their own Law they could not eat of the Sacrifices of Atonement appointed to reconcile God to them, which prefigured the Sacrifice of *Christ* upon the Cross, how could they partake at the Christian Altar of the Christian Sacrifice, which is the mystical Flesh and Blood of *Christ*, by which the Sacrifice of himself upon the Cross is represented according to his own Institution under the new Law, as it was under the old by the Sacrifices of Expiation or Sin-Offerings, whose Bodies were not to be eaten, but burnt without the Camp? And *Christ*'s Suffering without the Gate of *Jerusalem*, (as the Apostle evidently testifies in the Words immediately following the Text) signifies the Exclusion of all legal Eaters from partaking of him, who, as a

Lev. iv. 12. 21. vi. 30. xvi. 27.

Lev. iv. 35. v. 6, 10, 13. vi. 30.

Sin-

Sin-Offering, was carried without the Camp.

Here is Altar answering to Altar, and Sacrifice to Sacrifice; the Sacrifice which was a Figure of *Christ*'s Sacrifice upon the Cross before his Suffering, to that which is a Figure of it after. Which not only shews that ours is as proper a Sacrifice, and as proper an Altar as theirs was; but also that it is a Sacrifice of greater Worth and Dignity than those which they were permitted to eat of, as answering in a more particular manner to that Sacrifice, of which neither their Priests who were Ministers of the Tabernacle, nor their People, had any Right to Eat: But the Christian Priests and People have a right to Eat, even of this Sin-Offering, and consequently are admitted to an higher Favour and Privilege. Since we are then admitted to a so much greater Favour and Privilege than God allowed to his own chosen People, even whilst they continued to be his People; *let us*, as we are exhorted in the following Words, *go forth therefore unto* Christ, *without the Camp, bearing his Reproach. For here have we no continuing City, but we seek one to come. By him therefore let us offer the Sacrifice of Praise to God continually, that is the Fruit of our Lips, giving Thanks to his Name.*

From the whole then we may learn,

First, If the Holy Eucharist, as I trust has been sufficiently proved, be a visible material Sacrifice, representative of the one, true, and only meritorious and all-sufficient Sacrifice of *Christ*, of the same Nature with, tho' of greater Worth and Dignity, than the *Jewish* Sacrifices; it follows, that this cannot be the real and true Sacrifice of *Christ* himself, as the Church of *Rome* most wickedly and absurdly teaches; to support which vain Notion, she has invented the unintelligible Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*. For the *Representative* cannot be the Person *Represented*; the Thing *signifying*, cannot be the Thing *signified*. For the very Notion of a *Representative* implies something distinct from that which is *Represented* by it. Those therefore who charge the Doctrine of the *Eucharistical Sacrifice* as favouring of *Popery*, either know not what *Popery* is, or do not understand what a *Sacrifice* is, or have no right Notion of the *Eucharist* it self. For nothing can be more directly opposite to the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, or to *the Sacrifices of Masses in the which it was commonly said that the Priests did offer* Christ *for the Quick and the Dead*, than this Doctrine of *the representative Sacrifice of the Eucharist*. For if the *Representation* of *Christ*'s Body and Blood be there offered, then it is most certain *Christ* himself cannot be there offered;

Art. 31.

for

for the *Repreſentative* of *Chriſt* cannot be *Chriſt*, any more than a Man's *Proctor* or *Attorney* can be himſelf. This Doctrine therefore of a true and proper Sacrifice in the Euchariſt, repreſenting the one great and truly meritorious Sacrifice of *Chriſt*, is ſo far from favouring of *Popery*, that nothing can be more oppoſite to *Popery* than this is, nor can any other Doctrine be ſo effectual to root out all Popiſh Notions, relating to the bleſſed Sacrament of the Altar, as this is. For if we deny the Euchariſt to be a real and proper Sacrifice, we give the Papiſts a great Advantage over us. Becauſe they may eaſily prove from the Inſtitution of this Sacrament by *Chriſt*, from this and diverſe other Texts of Scripture, and from the Primitive Fathers of the Church, that it is a Sacrifice: And foraſmuch as our Church declares, that "this "Lord's Supper is in ſuch wiſe to be done "and miniſtred as our Lord and Saviour "commanded it to be done, as the holy A- "poſtles uſed it, and the good Fathers in "the primitive Church frequented it", they will eaſily ſhew, that if we do not believe the *Euchariſt* to be a *Sacrifice*, we do not hold to this Rule and Declaration of our Church, and Confute us from our own Principles. And when they have thus Confuted us, and clearly proved the *Euchariſt* to be a *Sacrifice*, and we have not Inſtructed

Homily of the Sacraments.

our People in the Nature of this Sacrifice, what a mighty Advantage do we give them to draw our People from us? For when they have thus convinced them of one Error in ſo Material a Point, how eaſily may it be to perſuade them that all our Doctrines are Erroneous alſo? But when we ſhew our People the true Nature of this *Sacrifice*, that it is not the very individual Sacrifice of
Heb. x. 10. *Chriſt* himſelf, for that was offered *once for all*, but only the Memorial, or Repreſentation of that Sacrifice, they will ſee clearly that the Popiſh Sacrifice of the Maſs, wherein they pretend to *offer* Chriſt *for the Quick and the Dead*, has no Foundation either in the Scripture or the ancient Fathers, but is clearly oppoſite to them; foraſmuch as the Picture cannot be the Man, whoſe Picture it is, nor the Repreſentative the Perſon he Repreſents. And therefore many of our beſt Divines, in their controverſial Writings againſt the Church of *Rome*, have acknowledged it as the Doctrine of our Church, that this *Sacrament is a* Sacrifice *which does repreſent the Sacrifice which Chriſt once offered: Wherein we ſet before God the Bread and Wine as Figures or Images of the precious Blood of* Chriſt *ſhed for us, and of his precious Body; an unbloody Sacrifice inſtituted by God, inſtead of the many Bloody Sacrifices of the Law:* And thereby have clearly confuted the Doctrine

See Dr. Hicke's *Appendix to two Treatiſes of the Chriſtian Prieſthood and Epiſcopal Order 3d Edit. p. 294. &c.*

of

of *Tranſubſtantiation* and of the *Maſs*. For how can this be an unbloody Sacrifice, or a Sacrifice without Blood, if therein the very Blood of Chriſt was offered up to God? There cannot therefore be a better, or more effectual Preſervative from Popery, as it has relation to the Holy Sacrament of the Altar, than this Doctrine of the Euchariſt being a true, proper, commemorative, Repreſentative and unbloody Sacrifice. But ſome Men have got a Cant of calling every thing Popery which they do not like; and when they are put to a *Non-plus*, and know not what to ſay, they hope That one Word is Confutation enough, altho' the Doctrine they oppoſe be never ſo inconſiſtent with Popery, as this undoubtedly is.

This Doctrine alſo of the *Euchariſtical Sacrifice* effectually ſtops the Mouths of our *Romiſh* Adverſaries, when they object to us, that we have no *Prieſthood*. For they ſay, That without a Sacrifice there can be no *Prieſt*: And they prove this by the Scriptures, which teach, *that every High Prieſt is ordained to offered Gifts and Sacrifices: wherefore it is of Neceſſity that* whoſoever pretends to be a Prieſt *have ſomewhat alſo to offer*, otherwiſe the Apoſtle would not have prov'd the Prieſthood of *Chriſt* by this Argument, And if we have no Prieſthood, then we have none amongſt us ſent by *Chriſt*, as *Chriſt* was ſent by the Father, that is, none who have ſucceed-

Heb. viii, 3.

Joh. xx. 21.

succeeded to the Apostles in their Office; and the whole Epistle to the *Hebrews* shews, that *Christ* was sent by the Father as a *Priest*, consequently the Apostles were sent by *Christ* as *Priests*, for they were sent by him as he was sent by the Father. And if we have none to succeed the Apostles in their Office, then
1 Cor. iv. 1. have we none that are Ministers of *Christ*, and Stewards of the Mysteries of God. And if we have no Ministers to dispense the Mysteries or Sacraments of God, then have we no Mysteries or Sacraments, and consequently no Church of God. Therefore if we have no Sacrifice, we have no Priesthood, no Religion amongst us. The Premises are all taken from the Scriptures, and the Consequences are natural and agreeable to the same Scriptures. And for my part I cannot see how we can answer our Adversaries of the Church of *Rome*, when they urge these Scriptures and these Consequences against us, but by shewing them that we have an Altar and a Sacrifice; that our Priests are true Priests, because they have somewhat to offer; that altho' they do not offer *Christ* himself, because the Scripture teaches that he was offered once for all; yet they offer Bread and Wine, which by our Lord's own Institution is appointed to represent his Body and Blood; and is by virtue of that Institution as effectual for the Remission of Sin, and procuring our perfect Union with him, as if we offered and drank the very real individual Body and Blood of Christ which was offered on the Cross. *Secondly*,

Secondly, If the Holy Eucharist is a Sacrifice, which by our Saviour's Inſtitution, fully and perfectly repreſents the one great and meritorious Sacrifice of *Chriſt* upon the Croſs, then is it much more excellent than any of the old Legal Sacrifices. Not more Excellent in its own Nature, for Bread and Wine have nothing in the Nature of them more worthy than the Blood of Bulls and of Goats, than the Libations of Wine, or the Oblations of Fine Flower, than Shew-Bread or Incenſe, but by virtue of the Inſtitution. For indeed there can be no natural Virtue in any Creature to make Atonement for Sin: Nothing can ſatisfy for Sin but the very Body and Blood of *Chriſt* himſelf. And the legal Sacrifices under the *Moſaical* Diſpenſation were propitiatory, only as they were appointed by Divine Inſtitution to be ſo, and as they were Types or Shadows of that great and truly meritorious Sacrifice of *Chriſt*. This is evident, becauſe if there had been any real intrinſick Virtue in the Sacrifice itſelf, then the Sacrifice, by whomſoever offered, or in whatſoever ſerious and devout Manner it had been offered, would have been acceptable to God, and have render'd him propitious or gracious to him who offer'd it, and to him for whom it was offer'd. Whereas we find by the Holy Scriptures, that if a Sacrifice was not offer'd by the

Prieſt,

Priest, whom God had appointed to make the Oblation; or if he offer'd it in another manner than God had appointed, it was so far from rendering God Propitious or Gracious, that it provok'd him to Anger, and drew down his Judgments. So when *Saul* was wearied out with waiting for *Samuel*, and therefore presum'd to offer a Burnt-offering himself, that Sacrifice was so far from procuring God's Favour, that it provoked him to reject *Saul*, and to give his Kingdom to another. Also when *Nadab* and *Abihu*, the Sons of *Aaron*, who were appointed by God himself to offer Sacrifice, when they did not offer in the manner prescribed, but *offer'd strange Fire, there went out Fire from the Lord, and devoured them.* These, with many other like Examples might be produc'd, are clear Testimonies that it was not the intrinsick Worth of any of these Sacrifices, but the Divine Appointment or Institution that made them acceptable, and render'd God Propitious and Gracious to those by or for whom they were offer'd. And so by this Divine Appointment the Sacrifice of the Eucharist being offer'd according to the Institution becomes Propitiatory, that is, renders God good and gracious to us, and procures his Pardon and Favour.

1 Sam. xiii. 8, &c.

Levit. x. 1.

In this respect then, that is, by virtue of the Divine Institution, the Sacrifice of the Holy

Holy Euchariſt far exceeds all the Sacrifices of the Law, and is far more excellent. For the Sacrifices of the Law were by their Inſtitution but imperfect Types of the great Sacrifice on the Croſs: They were appointed to render God Propitious or Gracious but in ſome Caſes, and on ſome Occaſions, not in all. There was no Sacrifice that could make an Attonement for Murder, and ſome other heinous Offences; but the Euchariſtical Sacrifice rightly and duly miniſtred and received, is an Attonement for the greateſt Sins, and by virtue of the Divine Inſtitution, procures Pardon for them, and renders God Propitious and Gracious to us, being truly faithful and penitent, notwithſtanding the foulest Crimes. This Sacrifice is not an imperfect Type, as the *Jewiſh* Sacrifices were, even by their Inſtiution, of the meritorious Sacrifice on the Croſs, but it is by virtue of the Inſtitution, the full and perfect Repreſentative of it, ſo as to convey to us all the Benefits and Bleſſings purchaſed by the Original. Whatever Sins *Chriſt*'s meritorious Death and Paſſion made Satisfaction for, whatſoever Sins are cleanſed by his Blood, the Pardon of them is conveyed to every worthy Receiver, in the Holy Euchariſt or Sacrifice of his Repreſentative Body and Blood. Now there are no Sins but what *Chriſt* made a Satisfaction for, the

the Scripture expreſly teaching, that *the Blood of* Jeſus Chriſt *cleanſeth us from all Sin. And he is the Propitiation for our Sins,* whatſoever they be, *and not for ours only, but alſo for the Sins of the whole World.* And he appointed this *Euchariſtical* Sacrifice to convey to every particular Perſon that ſhould receive it, all the Benefits of his Death and Paſſion. He appointed it to be ſuch a perfect compleat Repreſentative of his very Body which was broken, and of his very Blood which was ſhed for us, that he thought convenient to give it the Name of his Body and Blood, ſaying, *Take, eat; this is my Body. Drink ye all of it; For this is my Blood.* Therefore as St. *Paul* ſays, *The Cup of Bleſſing which we bleſs, is it not the Communion of the Blood of Chriſt? The Bread which we break is it not the Communion of the Body of Chriſt?* That is, Are not all the Bleſſings purchaſed for us by the Sacrifice of *Chriſt*'s Body and Blood, communicated or conveyed to us by this, *Euchariſtical Sacrifice* of Bread and Wine? Undoubtedly they are. Since then by *Chriſt*'s Body broken, and his Blood ſhed, there is a Satisfaction made, and a Pardon obtained for all Sins, it is manifeſt that this Pardon is conveyed to every Penitent and faithful Receiver of the Euchariſt; for that the Scripture teaches is the Communion of the Body and Blood of *Chriſt*, the Means by which he has appointed, that the Merits of his Death ſhall

1 Joh. i. 7. and ii. 2.

Mat. xxvi. 26.

1 Cor. x. 16.

be

be communicated to us: That is, the Pardon and Remiſſion of all Sins, of all Tranſgreſſions. Since therefore the Sacrifices of the Law could procure Pardon for ſome Sins only, not for all, and the Sacrifice of the *Euchariſt* is appointed to procure and convey the Pardon of all Sins, of all Tranſgreſſions, the *Euchariſt* is manifeſtly a more worthy and acceptable Sacrifice, by virtue of the Inſtitution, than all the Sacrifices of the Law.

Thirdly, Foraſmuch as the *Euchariſt* is a Sacrifice, it is certain that none can adminiſter it but a *Prieſt*, one particularly called and appointed by God to that Office, as was *Aaron*. Heb. v. 4. We find in the old Law, that when any who were not Prieſts, or Prophets particularly called and appointed by God to that Miniſtry, took upon them to offer Sacrifice, they were ſo far from making an Atonement, or rendering God propitious or gracious, that on the contrary they highly provoked him, and drew down his heavy Judgments. Thus *Korah*, *Dathan*, and *Abiram*, with *two hundred and fifty Princes of the Aſſembly, famous in the Congregation, Men of Renown*, were all cut off in a ſtrange unheard of manner, for taking upon them to offer the Sacrifice of Incenſe: Num. xvi. Thus *Saul*, as I have before ſhewn, was rejected from being King, for his preſuming to offer a Burnt-Offering: 1 Sam. xiii. 8, &c.

Thus

Thus *Jeroboam* offered Sacrifice himself, and made Priests himself for the same Purpose, driving away the Sons of *Aaron*, who were called of God to sacrifice to him, but these Priests and these Sacrifices were so far from being acceptable to God, that *this Thing became Sin unto the House of* Jeroboam, *even to cut it off, and to destroy it from off the Face of the Earth.* Thus also *Uzziah* presuming to offer Incense, was smitten with Leprosie, and continu'd a Leper to the Day of his Death. For it is the Priests peculiar *to offer both Gifts and Sacrifices for Sin*, and if any else shall presume to offer them, instead of rendring God propitious, they do but provoke him, and draw down his just Judgments on their Heads, as we may be satisfied from the foregoing Examples.

2 Chr. x. 13. 1 Kings xii. 26. &c. and xiii. 33.

2 Chron. xxvi. 16. &c.

Heb. v. 1.

What shall we say then to those presumptuous Men amongst our Dissenters of all sorts, who take upon them to offer this most excellent Sacrifice of the Holy Eucharist, a Sacrifice as I have shewed you, by virtue of the Institution of much more worth than all the Sacrifices of the Law? Can we think they can render God propitious and gracious to themselves or others by such Usurpation? Certainly God will not accept them, and this Presumption of theirs will be so far from bringing down a Blessing on them, that it must draw down a severe

a ſevere Curſe on their Heads: And they and all who partake with them in their pretended Communions, *eat and drink Damnation to themſelves, not diſcerning the Lord's Body*, for they have it not amongſt them. Their pretended Prieſts having no Right to offer, no Right to Miniſter that Holy Sacrament: Conſequently what thoſe unhappy, miſguided People partake of, is not the Sacrament, but a profane Mockery of that Divine Ordinance. 1 Cor. xi. 29.

Fourthly, Since the *Euchariſt* is a Sacrifice, an Oblation appointed by God himſelf, to render him propitious and gracious, and has no intrinſick Virtue in it ſelf to procure Pardon and Grace, but all its Worth and Virtue is derived only from its Inſtitution, whereby it perfectly repreſents and conveys to us all the Benefits purchaſed by the truly meritorious Sacrifice of *Chriſt*, let us be very careful to miniſter and partake of it as it was miniſtred by *Chriſt*, and received by his Diſciples. Let the Prieſt, who repreſents *Chriſt* himſelf on this Occaſion, in a more particular manner, as the Steward or Diſpenſer of his Myſteries, be eſpecially careful to perform every part of the Oblation himſelf as *Chriſt* did; not permitting the Oblation to be made by any other Hand, as is too commonly practiſed. I ſpeak with regard to the placing the Bread and Wine on the Altar: This is too frequently done by the Clerk or Sexton before 1 Cor. iv.

before the Office begins; a thing contrary to the Nature of an Oblation, and the expreſs Directions of our Rubrick, and by no means agreeable to *Christ*'s Inſtitution. For he himſelf took the Bread and the Cup, and made an Oblation of them to God, before he conſecrated them, or declared them to be his Body and Blood. *For he took Bread, and when he had given Thanks, he brake it.* By taking the Bread, and giving of Thanks, he plainly made an Oblation of it to God, before he brake it, and pronounced it to be his Body. We ought therefore, as he did, to make an Oblation of the Elements to God, before we conſecrate, or pronounce them to be the Body and Blood of *Chriſt*. Now the placing the Elements on the Altar, or the Lord's Table, makes them an Oblation to God, and ſeparates them from all common uſe; and to make an Oblation or Sacrifice, is, as I have ſhew'd you, the proper Office of the Prieſt, and it is the higheſt Preſumption, and a great Offence to God, for any one elſe to undertake it; Therefore it is neceſſary that the Prieſt place the Elements on the Table, for thereby it is that he makes them an Oblation, or preſents them to God; and having ſo preſented or offered them, he then, as our Church alſo directs, bleſſes them, beſeeching God to accept them, together with our Alms, which are alſo by him placed

Rubrick before the Prayer for the State of Chriſts Church.

there

there at the same time, saying, *We humbly beseech thee most mercifully to accept our Alms and Oblations.* Then after some other Prayers suitable to the Occasion, he consecrates, or declares them, in our Saviour's own Words, to be the Body and Blood of *Christ*. But if the Priest does not make an Oblation of the Elements before the Consecration, he does not minister this Sacrament as *Christ* ministred it, and fails in a very material Part, and consecrates what he has not first offer'd to God, which *Christ* did not do.

And as the Priest ought to minister this Holy Sacrament, as it was ministred by *Christ* himself, so ought the People to receive it, as it was received by his Disciples; that is, they ought to receive the whole Sacrament, not a Part of it only: Therefore the Church of *Rome*, which permits not the People to receive the Cup of the Lord, but the Bread only, is guilty of a sacrilegious Sin, and a most high Profanation of this Sacrifice: For I have shewed you at the beginning of this Discourse, that when a Sacrifice or Oblaton is made to God, that which is so offer'd, is then to be dispos'd of as God has appointed, and no otherwise; Because God has a more particular, peculiar Right in our Oblations than in other Things. All things indeed are God's, and he may dispose of them as

he pleaſes; however he has graciouſly vouchſafed to give them to us for our Uſe and Benefit. But when we return any of theſe Giſts to God, thereby making a Sacrifice or Oblation of them, as an Acknowledgment that we receive all from his Bounty or Goodneſs, what is ſo return'd is no longer ours, to be put to what Uſe we pleaſe, but muſt be diſpoſed of as God has directed; and if we diſpoſe of any part of it otherwiſe than he has directed, according to our own Will and Pleaſure, we are guilty of Sacrilege. Therefore when we have made an Oblation of Bread and Wine at the Lord's Table, if we do not diſpoſe of that Bread and Wine as he has directed, we are guilty of Sacrilege. Now when *Chriſt* inſtituted this Holy Sacrifice and Sacrament, he gave the Wine as well as the Bread to all his Diſciples, ſaying, *Drink ye all of this.* For this Reaſon, if the Wine as well as the Bread be not given to *all* the Communicants, then is not this Oblation entirely diſpos'd of according as God has rected, conſequently there is a Sacrilege committed: And the Church of *Rome* is guilty of this great Abomination, in denying the Cup to all but him that miniſters, when *Chriſt* himſelf communicated it to all that were preſent, and gave expreſs Command that we ſhould do as he did.

Gen i. 29. and ix. 3.

Fifthly,

Fifthly, Since the Holy *Euchariſt* is a Sacrifice perfectly repreſenting by Virtue of its Inſtitution, that great and truly meritorious Sacrifice of *Chriſt* himſelf, ſo that the Bread and Wine which we offer is accepted in the ſight of God, as the very Body and Blood of his only begotten Son, and as ſuch is communicated to us, then whenſoever we rightly and duly make this Oblation, we ſet before God the Memorial of his Son's Death, put him in Mind of that meritorious Sacrifice which has made a full, perfect and compleat Satisfaction for the Sins of the whole World. For though all Things are at all Times preſent with God, and therefore he needs no Memorial, nothing to put him in Mind of any thing on his own Account, as if he was forgetful, and did not always remember or know every thing; yet in compliance with our Infirmities, and to adapt himſelf to our Nature and Capacities, he is graciouſly pleaſed to require us to put him in Mind of what he knows and ſees infinitely better than we do. Thus we pray to him to put him in Mind of our Wants, and of our entire Dependance on him for a Supply of them: And yet he always ſees and knows our Wants, better than we do our ſelves, and knows whether we entirely depend on him or not, without our telling him that we do. However, he requires

our Prayers, and our Acknowledgement of this our Dependance, and is contented to be thus put in Mind of us, leſt otherwiſe we ſhould forget both him and our ſelves. Wherefore if we do not pray to him, but forget and neglect him, he will forget and neglect us; that is, he will not remember us for Good. Whenſoever then we make a Memorial before God, to put him in Mind of us, by our Prayers, our Alms, or our Oblations, it is not meant that we put him in Mind of what otherwiſe he might forget, but only that we thereby engage or induce him to be mindful of us, and to remember us for Good. So when we ſet before God the Memorial of his Son's moſt meritorinus Sacrifice, we plainly engage and induce him to confer on us all the Mercies and Graces purchaſed for us by that All-ſufficient Sacrifice: As Pardon of Sin, Reconciliation to God, Union with *Chriſt*, a Pledge or Earneſt of Eternal Life, and Grace and Strength to enable us to work out our own Salvation.

But if this Holy Sacrament be not a Sacrifice or an Oblation offer'd to God, (as ſome have of late pretended, contrary to the Doctrine of the Holy Scriptures, and of the pure Catholick Church in firſt Ages of Chriſtianity) but only a Commemoration made amongſt our ſelves, to put us only and not God in Mind of

Chriſt's

Chriſt's Death, then there is no Memorial offered to God; and if there be no Memorial of *Chriſt*'s Death offered to God in this Service, then cannot this Service engage or induce him to confer on us the Gifts and Graces purchaſed for us, by the All-ſufficient Sacrifice of *Chriſt*, more than any other common Service of Prayer and Praiſe: And if ſo, then is this Sacrament of no more Worth and Excellency than any other Service of the Church; and St. *Paul*'s Precept requiring a Man to examine himſelf before he preſumes to eat of this Bread, and drink of this Cup, was perfectly needleſs. For what occaſion can there be for ſuch an Examination before this Sacrament, more than before any other ordinary Duty, if no Memorial be offered to God of a more excellent Nature than our daily Prayers and Praiſes? But if there be a particular Memorial offered to God in the Holy Euchariſt, a Memorial of Chriſt's All-ſufficient and moſt meritorious Sacrifice, as undoubtedly there is, and that *Jeſus Chriſt* is there *evidently ſet forth, crucified amongſt us*, and if evidently ſet forth as crucified, then evidently ſet forth as offered for us; it plainly follows, that when ſuch a Memorial is made to God, to put him in Mind of all that his Son has done or purchaſed for us, thereby to induce him to confer on us all the Mercies and Graces obtained for us by *Chriſt*'s

1 Cor. xi. 28.

Gal. iii. 1.

Christ's Death; that we should be in a more especial manner careful to examine our selves before we presume to make this Offering, that we may not by our Impenitence, or want of Faith, draw down a Curse upon us instead of a Blessing, and so eat and drink our own Damnation.

Sixthly and *Lastly*, Since, as the Text assures, *We have an Altar whereof they have no right to eat, which serve the Tabernacle*; but we by the Rules of Opposition must have a Right to eat of it, for it is our Altar; let us not, by our own Impenitence, Unfaithfulness, or Negligence, deprive our selves of this Right. Let us consider, it is no small Privilege to be admitted to partake of this Altar, a Privilege to which God would not admit his own chosen People the *Jews*, for the Text plainly says that they had no right to eat of it; and I have shewed to you, that by the *Mosaical* Law they had no right to eat, even of that Sacrifice which they themselves offered, even as a Type of this. Since then God has vouchsafed us Christians a so much greater Privilege than he ever before allowed to his own chosen People, if we put a Slight and Contempt upon this high and extraordinary Privilege, we certainly deserve not to partake of any of those Benefits design'd to be conveyed to us by the right and due Use of it. If we will not come to the Lord's Table,

there

there to make our Oblation of Bread and Wine to him, as a Memorial to put him in mind of the Sacrifice of his Son, which there by Divine Inſtitution is fully and perfectly repreſented, and then to receive them from him again, as the repreſentative Body and Blood of *Chriſt*, conveying to us all the Benefits of his meritorious Death and Paſſion, we can have no good Grounds to hope that ever we ſhall partake of any of thoſe Benefits: And if we do not, what will become of us? For if our Sins are not pardoned, if we are not reconciled to God, and God to us, if we are not one with *Chriſt* and *Chriſt* with us, which are Graces vouchſafed to us in this Holy Sacrament; then are we in a moſt miſerable and unhappy Condition. Therefore let me entreat you to conſider this Matter ſeriouſly. Let me beg of you, as you regard your everlaſting Welfare, that you never wilfully deprive your ſelves of the great and unſpeakable Advanvantages of this Sacrament by your own Neglect: Do not fruſtrate God's Goodneſs by your own Wilfulneſs: When he offers you Grace and Favour, do not ſay you are not at leiſure to receive it yet, for you know not if you may live to another Opportunity: And if you will put ſuch a Contempt upon the Goodneſs of God as to think his Favours not worth your Acceptance, ſo long as you have any Buſineſs or

Pleaſure

Pleasure in this World to engage your Time or your Thoughts; and will not spare so much Leisure from your worldly Affairs, as to fit and prepare your selves to receive his Mercies when he offers them, you may justly fear, lest he also should be provoked to neglect you, and never offer these Favours to you again, but take you out of the World in the midst of your Affairs, before you have got your Pardon sealed, or made your Peace with him: For he has not obliged himself by any Promise, to wait your Leisure; therefore you have no reason to expect that he should do it. Let us then never neglect this so Beneficial a Service, but as often as we have Opportunity let us make our Oblation to God of the Memorial of *Christ*'s Sacrifice, that by receiving it from him again, we may therewith receive the Pardon of our Sins, Reconciliation with God, the Encrease of strengthning Grace, and become so firmly united to *Christ*, that nothing may ever be able to dissolve the Union; but being begun here in Grace, it may be consummated in Glory, thro' the Merits and Mediation of the same *Jesus Christ* our Lord; *To whom with the Father and the Holy Ghost be ascribed, as most due is, all Honour and Glory, now, and for evermore.* Amen.

6 AP 58

FINIS.

True Moderation.

A

SERMON

On PHIL. IV. 5.

By THOMAS BRETT. L. L. D.
Rector of Bettesʃhanger *in* Kent.

LONDON:

Printed for JOHN WYAT, at the *Roſe* in St. *Paul*'s Church-yard. 1714.

BRITISH MUSEUM

PHIL. IV. 5.

Let your Moderation be known unto all Men.

MOderation being a Vertue which has of late Years been wonderfully cried up, and continually in the Mouths of some, who glory in nothing so much as the Name of *Moderate Men*, and who are continually pressing this Portion of Scripture upon all zealous Members of the Establish'd Church, as if our Zeal for our most excellent Religion was not to be reconciled with this Precept of St. *Paul*, I think it very requisite that we should consider what is the true, natural, genuine Meaning of these Words, and the Duty required by the Apostle in this Text. In order to which I shall shew

First, What Moderation is, in what Sense it is a Vertue, and in what it is not so. And *Secondly*, How it is to be made known.

I. *First*, Then we may observe that *Moderation* is a Word not to be found in our *English* Bibles, except in this one Place, where some will have it, that it is not well ren-

der'd, as not anſwering the true Senſe of the Original. But I deſign not to find Fault with the Tranſlation, or to quarrel with the Word, which I think a very good one, if it be rightly underſtood. And I am perſuaded the beſt way to underſtand it may be, to conſider how our Tranſlators have render'd the original Word here us'd in other Parts of the New Teſtament. *Acts* xxiv. 4. we find it tranſlated *Clemency*. 2 *Cor.* x. 1. *Gentleneſs*, and 1 *Tim.* iii. 3. *Patience*. And in the Old Teſtament, *Pſal.* lxxxvi. 5. where the ſame Word is uſed in the *Greek*, we find it render'd a *Readineſs to forgive*. The *Latin* Tranſlations, as the *vulgar Latin*, *Arias Montanus*, *Beza* and *Tremelius* render'd it by ſuch Words as ſignifie *Lenity* or *Mildneſs*, *Equity*, *Modeſty* or *Humility*. And I take it that our Word *Moderation*, as it ſignifies a Vertue, and as it is to be underſtood in this Place, comprehends all theſe. So that to ſay, *Let your Moderation be known unto all Men*, is the ſame as to ſay, Behave your ſelves towards all Perſons, that whoſoever you have to deal with may find you to be *kind*, *gentle*, *patient*, *ready to forgive*, *mild*, *equal*, *modeſt and humble*. But certainly there is nothing in the whole Scripture that can give a Colour to that Conſtruction, which thoſe, who pride themſelves in the Name of *moderate Men*, put upon this excellent Precept: Who make the Moderation here recommended by St. *Paul* to conſiſt in having a moderate Opinion

for all Religions, and to believe it an indifferent thing, whether a Man goes to this Church, or to that Meeting-House. To think Epiſcopacy and an Epiſcopal Clergy a good political Inſtitution for ſome Times and ſome Countries, and what may be born and comply'd with as long as it can't be remedied, but that no Man has any Obligation in point of Conſcience to ſubmit to this Eccleſiaſtical Government, but that, if he diſlikes it, he may occaſionally or altogether ſeparate from it, and chooſe what Paſtor he pleaſes for himſelf, and he that blames him for ſo doing, is a Man, they ſay, that wants Moderation, and has no Regard to this Precept of the Apoſtle. In ſhort the *Moderation*, ſo much cry'd up at this Time, conſiſts in believing all Religions call'd Proteſtant to be agreeable to the Inſtitution of *Chriſt*, tho' they neither adminiſter his Word or Sacraments according as he has appointed, nor believe thoſe Articles of Faith which he has taught in the Goſpel. If we will be moderate according to the Moderation in faſhion, we muſt not condemn thoſe who deny our Saviour's Divinity, as the *Socinians*; thoſe who refuſe Baptiſm to Infants, and deny the Soul to live when ſeparated from the Body, as the *Anabaptiſts*; nor thoſe who reject both the Sacraments of Baptiſm and the Lord's Supper, and renounce the Lord that bought us, and redeem'd us with his Blood, believing in no other Chriſt but an imaginary one

one within themſelves, as the *Quakers*; nor muſt we call theſe Perſons *Heretick*s: Neither may we cenſure thoſe other Diſſenters who renounce Epiſcopal Government, and contemn the Orders and Service of our Church, ſetting up for themſelves Teachers according to their own Fancies, and ſeparating themſelves from our Communion, as the *Presbyterians* and *Independents*; nor may we call theſe *Schiſmaticks*. If we will be the faſhionable *moderate Men*, we muſt believe all theſe are in the right way to Heaven, at leaſt we muſt not tell 'em that they go wrong. No, if we do, we are high-flown, and want *Moderation*. But I muſt take the Liberty to ſay that ſuch a *Moderation* as this is ſo far from being a Vertue, that it is a ſhameful Vice, and therefore cannot be the thing which the Apoſtle recommends in the Text. For neither *Chriſt*, nor any of his Apoſtles have any where taught us to be indifferent or like-warm in Matters of Religion, but the quite contrary: We muſt be zealous and earneſt, both to preſerve the Faith and the Unity of the Church; and that not only at ſome certain Times, and on certain Occaſions, but at all Times, and on all Occaſions, for ſo this very Apoſtle St. *Paul*, who recommends *Moderation* to us in the Text, has elſewhere taught us: *It is good*, ſays he, *to be zealouſly affected always in a good thing, and not only when I am preſent with you.* If therefore Faith and the Unity of the Church are good Things, here

Gal. iv. 18.

is

is a plain Recommendation of a conſtant and perpetual Zeal for 'em. But we have not only ſuch a general Exhortation to Zeal for Religion and religious Matters; but we are particularly and expreſly commanded to be zealous for theſe two Things.

1. *Firſt*, The Holy Scripture enjoyns us to be earneſt for the Preſervation of the true Faith. Even St. *Paul* himſelf preſſes this upon us in this very Epiſtle, where he recommends *Moderation*, commanding us to *Stand faſt in one Spirit, with one Mind, ſtriving together for the Faith of the Goſpel.* Phil.i.27. The *Moderation* therefore, which he afterwards exhorts us to, muſt not be conſtrued to interfere with this Precept. For then we muſt make him to contradict himſelf in the ſame Place, and writing to the ſame Perſons. Again this ſame Apoſtle calls the *holding Faith* that is the adhering ſtedfaſtly to that *and a good Conſcience* the warring a *good Warfare.* 1 Tim. i. 18, 19. I am ſure this is not conſiſtent with yielding up our Faith to every one that ſhall oppoſe it, and permitting all Perſons to believe as they pleaſe, without daring to ſhew their Errors, and letting them know the dangerous Conſequences of 'em. How can we *fight the good Fight of Faith, and profeſs a good Profeſſion before many Witneſſes*, as we are exhorted to do, unleſs we publickly declare it in Oppoſition to all Hereſies whatſoever? 1 Tim.vi. 12. Can that Man comfortably ſay at his laſt Hour, *I have fought a good Fight, I have finiſhed my Courſe, I have kept the Faith,* 2 Tim.iv. 7.

who

who has never concerned himself for the Preservation of the Faith, who has always thought himself at liberty to believe as he listed, and that all others might do the same? Did St. *Paul* do thus? Was he of this Opinion? If so, how came he to undertake so many dangerous Journeys to so many Parts of the World, and to suffer so much in all Places where he came? But all this he did to propagate the true Faith, and that, to be sure, because he certainly knew that it was no indifferent Matter what Faith any Man professed. Well, but St. *Paul* did this to propagate the Christian Faith in general, but this is not the Case now: All Protestants profess the Faith which St. *Paul* taught, and therefore what Need is there now for this kind of Zeal? But did St. *Paul* teach that *Christ* was no more than a meer Man? No, he expressly taught the contrary; when he tells us, that he *is over all God blessed for ever.* Yet this is a Doctrine now taught and maintain'd by some that call themselves Protestants, but certainly we may oppose it, and I am sure I will do it upon all Occasions. Did St. *Paul* teach that the Soul cannot live separate from the Body, and that it sleeps with it in the same Grave till the Resurrection? If so, how came he to have a *Desire to depart, and to be with Christ?* How could he think that *far better* than to live here? Is there such a thing as better or worse in a State of Insensibility? Or could he hope for any Enjoyment of *Christ*

Rom. ix. 5.

Phil. i. 23.

Christ in such a State as made him incapable of enjoying any thing? And yet this Sleep of the Soul is asserted and defended by a whole Party of Protestants. Again, did St. *Paul* teach that there is no outward *Christ*, and that Baptism and the Lord's Supper are beggarly Elements? How came he then in all Places to preach that *Christ* which was crucified at *Jerusalem*, and never so much as to mention a *Christ within*, that ever I could find in his Writings? Why did he baptize whole Houshold, and give admirable Precepts concerning the Administration of the Lord's Supper? And yet we have an innocent Party, as they are called, that teach what is very contrary to St. *Paul* in these Matters. And shall we not offer to say that these are false and scandalous Doctrines, that they strike at the Foundation of Christianity, that they are heretical and pernicious, and consequently caution our Flocks that they be not seduced by such deceiving Wolves, whatsoever Sheep's Clothing they appear in? When Satan transforms himself into an Angel of Light, he is a more dangerous Enemy than when he appears barefac'd, for when he is so disguis'd, he would deceive, if it was possible, even the very Elect. And therefore no good Man need be afraid to oppose such notorious Errors, which are so contrary to the Faith, left he should be thought to want Moderation or Charity. For these Vertues are not to be extended to Errors and Heresies, but to Men, and we must oppose the Doctrines, however we deal with the Persons that hold

1 Cor. i. 23.

1 Cor. i. 16.

1 Cor. xi. 20, &c.

them. Nor ought we to be any whit the leſs earneſt to oppoſe theſe Principles of ſome that call themſelves Proteſtants, becauſe we have a common Enemy to deal with: For the Primitive Chriſtians had alſo two common Enemies that oppoſed their whole Religion, and perſecuted the Profeſſors of it in a moſt barbarous manner, I mean the *Jews* and the *Gentiles*, and yet the Apoſtles were nevertheleſs zealous to oppoſe the Doctrines of Hereticks and Seducers, exhorting the true Profeſſors to *contend earneſtly for the Faith which was once delivered to the Saints*, and that, not becauſe they had thoſe open and avowed Enemies to Chriſtianity in general, who publickly oppos'd and perſecuted the Church of God; but becauſe there were *certain Men crept in* amongſt them *unawares, who turned the Grace of God into Laſciviouſneſs, and denied the only Lord God, and our Lord Jeſus Chriſt.* As therefore the Apoſtles failed not to oppoſe the common Enemies, and to condemn the Doctrine of the *Jews* and *Gentiles*; ſo neither did they ceaſe upon all Occaſions to confute and cenſure thoſe, who tho' they made Profeſſion of Chriſtianity, yet taught ſuch things as were not conſiſtent with it. And whilſt we follow their Example, we need not fear loſing that *Moderation* required in the Text, whatever our new Pretenders to Moderation ſay to the contrary. We muſt ſay they endeavour to heal the Animoſities, Diviſions and Diſſenſions amongſt our ſelves, by allowing each others Opinions, and not be zealous for this or that Party, but only

Jud. ver. 3, 4.

ſhew

ſhew a firm, a brave and reſolute Adherence to the Proteſtant Intereſt throughout the World. As if there were no dangerous Principles, no pernicious Doctrines maintain'd by any that go under the Name of Proteſtants. But I hope I have ſaid enough to convince you of the contrary, and therefore let us not be deceived with ſpecious Appearances and fair Pretences, but let Men call themſelves by what Name they pleaſe, if they broach damnable Hereſies, I am ſure we ought not to ſide with 'em, and to ſay they have done no Wickedneſs in this Particular. We muſt not, we dare not be *moderate*, that is *indifferent* in ſuch things as theſe: If we ſhould be ſo, we may juſtly fear the Judgment wherewith God threaten'd the Angel of the Church of *Laodicea*, who was it ſeems a moderate Man, that is a Man who had no great Zeal for, or Care of that Church over which he preſided, and fancied that God was pleas'd with his being ſo, becauſe he found himſelf bleſs'd, as he imagin'd by this Means, he had gotten Preferment, and was grown Rich by it. And this is juſt as our moderate Men plead now for themſelves, we are the rich Men, the trading Men of the Nation, would God bleſs us thus if our Ways pleas'd him not? But let us hear what God ſays to ſuch Trimming: *I know thy Works, that thou art neither cold nor hot: I would thou wert cold or hot. So then becauſe thou art luke-warm, and neither cold nor hot, I will ſpue thee out of my Mouth. Becauſe thou ſayeſt I am rich, and increaſed with Goods, and have need of nothing; and knoweſt* Rev. iii. 15.

not that thou art wretched, and miſerable, and poor, and blind and naked. We ſee then that this kind of Moderation, this Trimming in Religion, this Luke-warmneſs and Want of Zeal for the Faith we profeſs, is odious in the ſight of God. And I believe, if we enquire, we ſhall find it ſo in the ſight of Man too. For who can have any real Value for that Man, who is not firm to what he profeſſes? Who indeed appears to be a Church-man, but nevertheleſs thinks that all the Diſſenters are in as good and fair a way to Heaven, and therefore he can join in Communion with any of 'em: Who believes that if he do but rail heartily at Popery, that it is perfectly indifferent what other Church he ſides with. But tho' this kind of Moderation, which is perfectly oppoſite to that Zeal, which the Scriptures preſs to be now ſo much in Vogue; yet if Men would but give themſelves leave to think, they could not believe it to be a Vertue, how much ſoever ſome cry it up for one. Would any one, think you, believe himſelf commended, if it ſhould be ſaid that he is a moderate or indifferent Lover of God, his Country, or his Friends? Would he not be much better pleas'd to be call'd an hearty zealous Lover of all theſe? How then can the Name of a moderate, indifferent Church-man be honourable? If our Church be good, we ought to love it heartily, and ſeek its Welfare with Zeal and Earneſtneſs: But if it be bad, we ought not to love it at all. So that be it how it will, a moderate indifferent Love for it is no way juſtifiable.

II. *Se-*

II. *Secondly*, As the Scriptures require us to be zealous and not moderate, with relation to our Faith, ſo alſo they require the ſame, with regard to the Unity of the Church, to our living in Communion one with another, and avoiding all Diviſions and Separations one from another. *Now I beſeech you, Brethren, by the Name of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt*, ſays St. *Paul, that ye all ſpeak the ſame thing, and that there be no Diviſions among you, but that ye be perfectly joined together in the ſame Mind, and in the ſame Judgment.* Now what were theſe Diviſions which St. *Paul* here ſpeaks of? They were not any Contentions about the Faith, but only ſome little trifling Matters, as which of their Paſtors ought chiefly to be follow'd, whoſe Congregation they ſhould join themſelves to, whether that of *Paul*, or of *Apollos*, or of *Cephas*. Not that theſe three had any Difference between themſelves, or that one of them taught any Doctrine contrary to the other, or that they ſeparated in Communion one from another, but only ſome factious Perſons took occaſion to abuſe their Names to Countenance their own Diviſions: And St. *Paul* in condemning this Abuſe, was willing to ſpare the Perſons who had cauſed it, as being minded to ſee if they would be brought to a better Temper without it. Wherefore he ſays, That *in a Figure he tranſferred theſe things to himſelf, and to Apollos.* As though he had ſaid, ſince our Names have been abuſed by ſome of you upon this Occaſion, and that there are amongſt you ſome, that boaſt you are followers of *Paul*, and not

1 Cor. i. 10.

1 Cor. iv. 6.

not of *Apollos*, and others, that they are followers of *Apollos*, and not of *Paul*, I am willing to Name no other Persons at this time, but supposing it be so, that some of you were converted by one of us, and some by the other, I would have you know that this ought to make no Difference amongst you; but that you should still joyn in one and the same Communion, and *not be puffed up for one against another*, nor break out into Factions upon this Account, to the despising of one another.

After this, he shews how the Unity of the Church, which is the mystical Body of Christ is to be preserv'd, by comparing it with the natural Body. For, says he, *as the Body is one and hath many Members, and all the Members of that one Body being many, are one Body; so also is Christ.* As therefore the Members of the natural Body must be united to one another to preserve the Body entire; so must the Members of *Christ*, continue in Union one with another, or else his mystical Body will be maimed: For this is a natural Consequence of this Comparison. And as he adds, *God has tempered the Body together*, giving to every Member even to the most feeble and least honourable Parts, their proper Office, *to the end*, says he, *that there should be no Schism in the Body; but that the Members should have the same Care one for another.* Then by subjoining, *Now ye are the Body of Christ and Members in particular*, He plainly intimates, That in this mystical Body, the Church, there ought to be no Separation of Interests, no Divisions or Dissentions

1 Cor. x. 10.

ſentions from one another, but that all ſhould have the ſame common Intereſt and concern, *endeavouring to keep the Unity of the Spirit in the Bond of Peace.* Eph. iv. 3. And, to convince us of the abſolute Neceſſity of ſtudying to preſerve this Union, he ſhews us, that without this Love or Charity for the Body of *Chriſt*, all other Gifts and Graces are of no Value, ſo that the underſtanding *all Myſteries and all Knowledge*, the having *a Faith able to remove Mountains*, if it want this Love or Charity to the Body of Chriſt, *it profiteth nothing.* And he, who ſeeks to ſeparate and divide this Body, is an Enemy to Chriſt, the Head of it, *tho' he ſpeak with the Tongues of Men and of Angels.* Wherefore the Apoſtle prays for the *Romans*, that they may be *like-minded one towards another, according to Chriſt Jeſus.* Rom. xv. 5. And exhorts the *Philippians*, to *be like-minded, having the ſame Love, being of one accord, of one mind.* Phil. ii. 2. And our Saviour in the laſt Prayer he made for us before he was betray'd, beg'd that we might be preſerved in Unity, ſaying, *Holy Father, keep thro' thine own Name thoſe whom thou haſt given me, that they may be one as we are.* Joh. xvii. 11. And now, can it be thought that Chriſtian Moderation ſhould oblige us to join with, or to countenance, thoſe who deſtroy this Union which Chriſt ſo earneſtly pray'd might be preſerv'd? That we ſhould adhere to, or aber ſuch Party-Makers as tear and rent the Body of Chriſt, by ſeparating the Members of it one againſt another? Our new faſhion'd Moderate Men pretend indeed, That they would take away theſe cauſeleſs Diviſions, that they deſire

to

to heal theſe Wounds of the Church, and that they take the right Method for it; which is, not to ſtand ſtiff for Ceremonies, nor contend with a weak Brother for indifferent Matters, but to yield to 'em and comply with 'em in theſe things. And to ſhew their Readineſs to comply with them, they will ſometimes go to their Meetings, and joyn with them in their way of Worſhip, at other times, and upon occaſion, they will come to the eſtabliſhed Church and communicate with us. And this, ſay they, is the Way to make both one, and a moſt certain Token of their great Moderation. But will the countenancing two ſeparate Parties, and the making them believe that we think them both to be in the Right, ever Unite 'em? Will the Diſſenters be brought to conform to the Church, by ſeeing the Church-men coming over to their ſide? Or will the Church think it reaſonable to yield to the Diſſenters, when they ſee the Diſſenters, can upon Occaſion, and without making any Scruple of it, joyn with us in all Parts of Divine Worſhip? May we not juſtly ſay to 'em, If you think our Communion to be ſinful, why do you communicate with us at all? If it be not ſinful, and you can joyn with us, why do you make a cauſeleſs Diviſion, and rent the Seamleſs Coat of *Chriſt*, when you are forced to own there is no juſt Occaſion for it? We may very well ſay to theſe Moderate Church-men, or Moderate Diſſenters, that divide themſelves between one ſide and the other,

and

and keep ſtedfaſt to neither, what *Elijah* ſaid to the *Iſraelites* on the like Occaſion, *How long halt ye between two Opinions? if the Lord be God follow him, but if Baal, then follow him.* If the Diſſenters are the true Church of Chriſt, follow them: If the eſtabliſhed Religion be Chriſt's true Church follow that. It is certain, both cannot be in the Right. For Chriſt cannot be divided any more than the natural Body, and St. *Paul* has taught us that *as the Body is one, ſo alſo is Chriſt.* Now there is certainly a Diviſion between us, we are ſeparated the one from the other, we cannot therefore be both of us ſound uncorrupt Members of the ſame Body. He therefore who Trims between both, muſt neceſſarily be corrupt on one ſide or t'other. The Man who keeps firm and ſtedfaſt to one, may poſſibly be in the Right, but he that halts between both muſt certainly be in the Wrong. There is a plain apparent Schiſm between us, and conſequently, one Party muſt be Schiſmatical. He therefore that joyns indifferently with both ſides, undoubtedly countenances the Schiſm on which ſide ſoever it lies, and conſequently is a Schiſmatick, or an Abettor of Diviſions in the Chriſtian Church, whoſoever elſe is not one. I ſhall not here concern my ſelf about the Diſſenters Opinions, wherein they differ from us, for we ſhould have nothing to ſay againſt 'em, if they did not form a Schiſm. We would never fall out with a Man, whether a black Gown or a Cloak was the moſt decent Habit, provided he would make no Diſturbance about

1 Kings xviii. 21.

it, and not gather a ſeparate Congregation upon ſuch a trifling Matter. For Men may differ and argue about Opinions, without either Breach of Charity, or of the Unity of the Church, which requires not that all ſhould be of the ſame Opinion, but of the ſame Communion. And for this Unity in Communion, we ought to be zealous and not Moderate, for the tearing Chriſt's Body can be no indifferent Matter. But our Moderate Men, as they love to be called, tell us, that we and thoſe Diſſenters they joyn with are all one in Subſtantials, and that we differ only in a few little needleſs and indifferent Ceremonies, and to let us ſee that they account this Difference to be no ways Material, they think they may go indifferently either to Church or Meetings. But if the Difference be ſo little, why is there a Separation? Why can we not agree all of us to worſhip God in the ſame Way? Why do theſe *Diſſenters*, which think our Communion Lawful, come and draw away our Members from us? Why do they form diſtinct Congregations, and quit their Legal Paſtors? And do not they which go to theſe Meetings, tho' but occaſionally, countenance this Separation and Diviſion, which they are forced to own to be needleſs, and without juſt Cauſe? If the Terms of our Communion are not ſinful, 'tis certainly a damnable Sin, for thoſe who are of this Opinion to ſeparate, or to countenance and uphold ſuch a Separation, for they maintain and ſupport a Diviſion and Schiſm, in the Church of Chriſt, without any juſt Cauſe given

given for it. But if our Way of Worship be sinful, 'tis a damnable Sin to joyn so much as once in our Communion. So that the Moderate Man, who stands between the Church and the Meeting-house, is guilty of a damnable Sin, which side soever is in the Right. This kind of Moderation then, which is now so fashionable and so much cried up, cannot be the Moderation required by St. *Paul* in the Text: For that Apostle would certainly never exhort us to anything that is sinful.

Having thus shewn you, what true *Moderation* is, that it consists in *Kindness, Gentleness, Patience, Readiness to forgive, Mildness, Impartiality, Modesty, and Humility*, towards all Persons whatsoever, but that it is by no Means to be extended to that Indifferency in Religion, to which some would apply it. Provided therefore, that it be not wrested to the Prejudice of the true Faith and of the Communion of the Church, I will go as far as any in extending it to other Matters and Persons. In order to which, I will now briefly shew,

II. *Secondly*, How our Moderation should be made known unto all Men. And this is to be done not by shewing an Indifferency towards our Religion, but by shewing ourselves kind to all Men whatsoever, and what Religion soever they are of. We ought always carefully to distinguish betwixt the Vice and the Man, and howsoever we are to abominate and hate the one, we must be nevertheless ready upon all Occasions to do Good to the other. Is such a one a profane, lewd, vicious Liver, let us detest the

Profaneness, but still let us not detest the Man. Let us endeavour what we are able, and as far as we have Opportunity, to reclaim him from his Vice, but let us not be vicious with him to shew our Moderation that Way. So also is any one an Heretick or a Schismatick; let us hate the Heresie and loath the Schism, but let us not hate or loath the Persons guilty of it. Let us if we can study to reduce em and bring 'em back into the Way of Truth and of Righteousness, but let us not to shew our Moderation become Heretical or Schismatical with 'em: Let us not joyn with 'em in their Divisions, nor unite ourselves to their Separate Assemblies. Let us study to do good to their Persons, but let us pray still against their Wickedness; Let our Moderation be made known to em by our Readiness to do 'em all Acts of Charity and good Nature; if they need our Help or Assistance let us freely and cheerfully afford it 'em; Let us relieve their Wants, and contribute to their Necessities according as we have Opportunity and Ability. If they are naked let us cloth them, if hungry let us feed 'em, if a thirst let us give 'em Drink, and let 'em see that we want no Bowels of Charity or Compassion for them, how loever we dislike their Ways, and disapprove their Deeds and Practices. Our Saviour has taught us in one of his excellent Parables, that Difference in Religion should by no means make a Difference in our Charity and Compassion. When the Traveller who went from *Jerusalem* to *Jericho* fell amongst Thieves and was grievously

Luk. x. 30.

grievously wounded and severely handled by them, the good *Samaritan* tho' of a different Religion shewed all the Care and Kindness to him that he was able, when the Priest and the Levite who saw his Distress and Anguish pass'd by him without any Regard or Compassion, he *went to him and bound up his Wounds, pouring in Oil and Wine, and set him on his own Beast, and brought him to an Inn, and took care of him: And on the Morrow when he departed, he took out two Pence and gave them to the Host, and said unto him, take care of him, and whatsoever thou spendest more, when I come again I will repay thee.* Now this *Samaritan* was a Man of so different a Religion from the Traveller, that they would not so much as trade or have any Commerce with one another upon the Account of that Difference in their Way of Worship. *For the Jews* had no Dealings with the *Samaritans.* And 'tis our Lord's Command that we should do as this *Samaritan* did. But tho' our Saviour recommended this pious charitable Act of the good *Samaritan*, yet he is far from recommending his Religion to us. For he plainly told the Woman of *Samaria*, that *they worshipped they knew not what.* By all which I think our Saviour has evidently instructed us how to express our Moderation. Not by complying with Dissenters in their different Principles from us, but by not letting such different Principles lessen our Bowels of Compassion towards 'em. That our Moderation therefore may be made known unto all Men, we must, by our constant Practise and Behaviour towards All, let

Joh. iv. 9.

Joh. iv. 22.

let every one see that we do not confine our equal fair Dealing, our Love or Charity, our Kindness, Meekness, Gentleness, Forbearance, Patience, Readiness to forgive, our Modesty and Humility to those of our own Persuasion or Party, but that we are still ready to *do Good to all Men, but especially to them who are of the Houshold of Faith.* That tho' our first Care and Concern be for those whom we judge the truest and most faithful Servants of Christ; yet we shall never be wanting to do all good Offices to those who differ from us, according as our Occasions and our Abilities will permit. And as our Moderation is to be made known by our equal fair Dealing, and our Love and Charity towards all Men, how different soever their Persuasions may be in Matters of Religion; so also should we shew it by bearing with a weak Brother in private Opinions which neither affect the true Faith of Christ, nor the Unity of the Church, such as those mentioned by St. *Paul, One believeth he may eat all things, another who is weak eateth Herbs. One Man esteemeth one day above another: Another esteemeth every day alike.* These were no other than private Scruples concerning such things, as neither Christ nor his Church had made any Determination, but had left them as they were, perfectly indifferent, and so every Man was at Liberty to judge for himself what he ought to do in these Matters. In these therefore, and such like Doctrines which neither one Way or other prejudice the Faith or Unity of the Church, the Apostle has expresly declared, that we should not

Gal. vi. 10.

Rom. iv. 14.

not judge or cenſure one another; but as we take our own Liberty, ſo let us leave others to enjoy theirs. But the Caſe is very different with relation to ſuch things, as either Chriſt or his Church have determined, however indifferent they may be thought in their own Nature. For as to what St. *Paul* here ſpeaks of, *eſteeming every day alike*, which he puts down as an indifferent Opinion, which we ought not to diſpute or contend about; ſhall we extend this to the Obſervation of the Lord's day, which the Church has from the Apoſtles times ſet apart, and dedicated to the particular Service of God? I ſuppoſe none will urge this Text of Scripture to excuſe any who ſhall refuſe to obſerve it. Again, let us ſhew our Moderation to all, by our gentle Behaviour towards thoſe who differ from us even in Fundamentals. And howſoever zealous we are for the Preſervation of the Faith, and the Peace of the Church, let us ſtill reaſon with 'em, and endeavour to *reſtore 'em in the Spirit of Meekniſs.* Let us *not bring againſt 'em railing Accuſations*, leſt that ſerve but to provoke 'em, and drive them, if it be poſſible, further from us. Let us bear long with them, and endeavour to reduce 'em to the Fold from whence they are ſtrayed by all the Methods of Mildneſs, of Love and Charity. Let them ſee that we have a moſt tender Care and Compaſſion for them, and that we deſire to pull them out of that Fire into which they have run themſelves by departing from us. But as the Apoſtle ſays, we are in this Caſe to *make a difference*. We muſt

Gal. vi. 1.

Jud. v. 9.

Jud. v. 22.

di-

distinguish the best we can, between those who are led away thro' Ignorance, and those who offend of malicious Wickedness. For as there are some who are seduced by the Prejudices of an Unhappy Education, or thro' Want of Knowledge, which has made 'em apt to be drawn aside by the specious Pretences and fair Speeches of cunning Deceivers, so as they have not been able to see the Wolf thro' his Sheep's cloathing, and these should be gently treated, and the Errors of their Ways should be shewed to 'em in the mildest Manner; so there are others whom the Apostle calls, *Evil Beasts, always Liars, who must be rebuked sharply.* To conclude therefore, *Let our Moderation be known to all Men*, not by our Compliance with 'em in their Separations and Divisions, but by our Meekness, our Kindness, our Charity and gentle Behaviour towards all; not by our running with 'em into their Errors, but by endeavouring to reduce 'em from the Error of their Ways, that they may be saved in the day of the Lord. By shewing a true Affection both to their Bodies and their Souls, tho' we can have none either for their Principles or Practices. And howsoever Men may censure or condemn this *Moderation*, as contrary to the *Moderation* now in Vogue, we may be satisfied, that God will accept of it, since it is agreeable to his most holy Word and Commandment. And having done our Duty herein, we may be assured, that we shall not fail of a Reward at the last Day, thro' Jesus Christ our Lord. To whom with the Father, &c.

Tit. i. 21, 13.

FINIS.

6 AP 58